

# THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY.

VOL. XV.

APRIL, 1911.

No. 2.

## WALTHER THE LUTHERAN.

"The Lutheran Church of this country mourns the departure of a spiritual father. . . . A very particular mission to the Lutheran Church of this century had been entrusted by God to this man"<sup>1)</sup> — pensively the eye rests on these simple, yet far-reaching statements, which suggest two splendid *Richtlinien* for reflection: Walther and the Lutheran Church of America; Walther and the Lutheran Church of the Nineteenth Century.

The words quoted were uttered on May 15, 1887, at Walther's bier, when the remains of the great American Lutheran were about to be transferred from Concordia Seminary, whose President and best-known professor he had been, to "old Trinity," the Lutheran mother-church of St. Louis, whose beloved *pastor primarius* he had been up to the hour of his death. The speaker, Walther's pastor, was a man not given to excessive praising or idolizing of men. The statements which he made regarding his famous parishioner were a sober estimate of Walther's worth, and they were spoken reverently and in the fear of God. In the same spirit we study these words, now that the centenary of Walther's birth is upon us, and seek to verify their scope and applicableness.

The Walther memorial of this year is to witness no hero-worship on the part of Missourians, no fulsome eulogies, no injudicious and unreflecting exaltation of human achieve-

1) *Lutheraner* 1887, p. 85.

ments. Missourians may think much of Walther personally, as a scholar, an author, an administrator, a friend. These are minor matters. But Walther's life and work can be viewed as a fact, a deed of divine Providence and Mercy. *As such* it deserves study. God *did* intend something particular when He raised up this man and guided him as He has done. It has been said by a non-Missourian that, in sending Walther, God took pity on the Lutheran Church of America.<sup>2)</sup> Another writer, not a Missourian, sums up his estimate of Walther in these words: "From every part of the Lutheran Church in the Old World and the New his death elicited the testimony: A great one in Israel is fallen! . . . His was, indeed, an epoch-making personality, and from his activity mighty impulses radiated to Lutherans in all parts of the world. 'I bow my head to him in humility,' said the President of the General Lutheran Conference, Dr. Kliefoth, at the convention in Hamburg, in 1887."<sup>3)</sup>—We have here exactly the same ideas as above, only differently worded: Walther's influence on the Lutheran Church of America, and of the Nineteenth Century. And this influence is dated back to God as the cause.

Whatever God accomplishes is to the child of God a matter of interest and an affair of moment, from which he draws wholesome lessons of enlightenment and comfort. Outside of what *God* achieved through Walther everything else is, at best, an interesting reminiscence, a gratefully cherished remembrance, but no more. These things will vanish, have already vanished to a great extent; the divine work for which Walther served as a tool will abide. It has become a historical fact. It has been worked into the texture and fabric of Lutheranism. Ingratitude may bury it in oblivion; bias may minimize its value; but it cannot be removed. It is there to stay. While God's Word and Luther's doctrine abide to rouse Lutheran consciousness and to quicken the Lutheran

---

2) Dr. Kummer in PRE2, vol. 18, p. 695, quoting the General Council publication *Pilger durch Welt und Kirche*, vol. 5, p. 370.

3) Dr. Spaeth in PRE3, vol. 20, p. 848.

conscience, the work of Walther will again and again assert its value and exert its power. Since, let us say, 1844, the year when *Der Lutheraner* began to be published, it is simply impossible to write a true history of Lutheranism without taking into account the mighty influences that emanated from Walther.

---

At the time when Walther began his public career as an expounder of Lutheranism, Dr. Schmucker was the acknowledged oracle of the Lutheran Church in America. His "Elementary Course of Biblical Theology, translated from the work of Professors Storr and Platt" appeared in its second edition in 1836; and his "Elements of Popular Theology; with occasional references to the Doctrines of the Reformation, as avowed before the Diet at Augsburg in MDXXX" was running in its sixth edition in 1848. "Portraiture of Lutheranism," by the same author, was "a discourse delivered by request at the consecration of the First English Lutheran Church, Pittsburgh, October 4, 1840, during the session of the Synod of West Pennsylvania, and published by resolution of said body." This discourse with a number of others, was expanded into "The American Lutheran Church, Historically, Doctrinally, and Practically Delineated," which came out in its sixth edition in 1853. A few selections from these writings will lead us to understand what a shock American Lutheranism received, when Walther's voice rang out in the land,—and how necessary it was that American Lutheranism should receive just such a shock.

"The Lutheran Church, in the United States, . . . has indeed always regarded the Augsburg Confession as the authorized summary of her doctrines, but has not required any oath of obligation to all its contents. The General Synod of the Lutheran Church has adopted only the 21 doctrinal articles, omitting even the condemnatory clauses of these, and also the entire Catalogue of Abuses corrected. No minister, however, considers himself bound to believe every sentiment contained



in these twenty-one articles, but only the fundamental doctrines. Accordingly, the pledge of adoption required at licensure and ordination is couched in the following terms:

"1. Do you believe the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments to be the Word of God, and the *only infallible* rule of faith and practice?

"2. Do you believe that the fundamental doctrines of the Word of God are taught, in a manner *substantially* correct, in the doctrinal articles of the Augsburg Confession?

"The Lutheran divines of this country are not willing to bind either themselves or others to anything more than the fundamental doctrines of the Christian revelation, believing that an immense mass of evil has resulted to the Church of God from the rigid requisition of extensive and detailed creeds. The Savior and His apostles have left no other creed than that contained in the Scriptures, and although experience and the nature of the case require some mutual agreement as to the doctrines to be inculcated by the ministry in any portion of the Church of Christ, lest one should demolish what the other is laboring to build up, yet we can see no sufficient warrant for any Christian Church to require as a term of admission or communion greater conformity of view than is requisite to harmony of feeling and successful cooperation, in extending the kingdom of Christ.

"What unshackled friend of truth can doubt that the introduction of so many minor ramifications of doctrine into Modern Confessions of faith, and the requisition of them all as terms of ecclesiastical admission and communion, destroyed the natural estimate which every unbiased mind would form of the relative importance of each? Who can doubt that men were thus led to regard and denounce as heretics the members of other communions, who held as cordially as they themselves did, all the essentials of the Christian system, and in the eyes of the great Head of the Church were perhaps more acceptable than their self-erected judges? In short, it cannot be denied that the enormous amplitude of the Protestant Symbols, and

the unqualified assent to them, which was for a long time required in all the churches, and is even now demanded in some, were and ever would be a bone of endless contention, and the prolific mother of *bigotry* and *sectarianism*. Had the early Protestants endeavored to select the principal and fundamental doctrines of Christianity, required a belief of them from all applicants for admission into their ranks, and agreed among themselves that discrepancy of views on matters of non-fundamental nature should neither be a bar to ecclesiastical communion nor fraternal affection, they would have saved the Church from the curse of those dissensions by which piety was in a degree destroyed, and, on several occasions, the very foundations of Protestantism shaken. What can be more painful to the true Christian than to witness those who love the Lord Jesus wasting their strength in mutual crimination for departure from some jot or tittle of a creed, not involving the grand scheme of Gospel truth, nor clearly determined in Scripture, which ought to be directed against the enemies of the cross, which ought to be expended in bringing sinners to Christ?

“But although the Lutheran divines are strenuous advocates for liberty of thought and free, untrammelled investigation of God’s Word, there is really as much doctrinal agreement and more harmony of feeling among them than is found in any other church in America. Indeed, we do not hesitate to record it as our deliberate opinion that full latitude of investigation within the bounds of fundamentals is better calculated to beget unity of faith than extensive symbolic restrictions. How can that man be an impartial inquirer after truth, how can he throw open his soul to the full influences of evidence, who knows that exclusion from his ecclesiastical connections, ejection from his pastoral charge, and the exposure of his dependent family to poverty and want, would be the consequence, if his investigations should result in the rejection of a single article in his confession of faith?”<sup>4)</sup>

4) *Popular Theology*, pp. 49 ff.



The above remarks are from a work, "explanatory of the doctrines of the Lutheran Church, and undertaken by request of the General Synod of said Church." It was "designed chiefly for private Christians and theological students." Hence, this work comes backed with the authority of the leading Lutheran organization of the country, and it has a formative mission: its aim is to raise the Lutheran *comme il faut*, a suave, urbane, "Christian" gentleman, who says to you: "Brother, we agree to disagree. What profit is there to either of us in quarreling over non-essentials? We condemn no one, except persons who will trammel our thought and refuse to pay us our perquisites. It is a pity those old confessional standards were ever raised. If we have Christ and the apostles on our side, is not that sufficient?"

We are naturally desirous to ascertain what a Lutheran of this *genus* has learned from Christ and His apostles.— On the inspiration of the sacred writers the same author expresses himself as follows: "Matt. 13, 52; 10, 27. There certainly were instances in which the apostles were to speak without any preparation, Luke 21, 14, and in which their superior helper, who promised to supply the want of preparation, must necessarily do more than merely inspire them with intrepidity and presence of mind; since otherwise they could not dispense with previous reflection, so necessary to give value and effect to their communications. . . . But if special aid was given whenever it was necessary, it follows that when it was not given, it would have been superfluous; and, therefore, that when the apostles were left to the use of their own powers, their instructions were no less conformable to the will of their divine Instructor than when they were directed by His special aid. . . . The apostles doubtless thought for themselves, that is, exercised their natural faculties, and communicated their own thoughts, both in their oral and written instructions. . . . As far as the credibility of the apostolical instruction is concerned, it is a matter of perfect indifference whether we believe that the Spirit of God sug-

gested the very words in which those instructions were uttered or written, or whether the Spirit only guided and aided them, from time to time, so far as necessary. The former supposition, however, does not seem to comport with the diversity of style and arrangement in the apostolical writings.”<sup>5)</sup> — “That nothing may be advanced to which the most anxious and scrutinizing examination of Christianity can attach the least shadow of doubt, I shall seldom rely, exclusively, on proofs derived from the antilegomena of the New Testament; or on the authority of those books of the Old Testament which are not explicitly quoted in the New, as divine; or on books, the authority of which depends not merely on their historical credibility, but also on the divine authority of Mark and Luke.”<sup>6)</sup>

That there is considerable rationalistic leaven in this exhibition of the formal principle of the Reformation goes without saying. The material principle fares little better. The imputation of Adam’s guilt to his posterity and the damnable condition of man’s natural condition under sin, the atonement of Christ, by which the sinner world has been reconciled to God, prior to any person’s faith in the vicarious work of Christ, the doctrine of salvation by faith, exclusive of any human merit, are presented on the ground of copious and pertinent Scripture texts. Notwithstanding this, the author has no scruple in saying: “All this (the blessings of salvation) is suspended on the condition that we believe the doctrine concerning the salvation.” The author acknowledges that faith “is by no means the meritorious cause of our salvation. . . . Nor has this confidence in the Redeemer so high an intrinsic value as to entitle us to the great salvation which is promised to believers, as a merited reward. Faith is not really a virtue or righteousness, by which we become worthy of so great a salvation; . . . faith in the promises of God presupposes the truth of those promises, and does not create it by first believing it.” Nevertheless he insists that “the condition of sal-

5) *Biblical Theology*, p. 127 f. 144 f.

6) *Ibid.*, p. 177.

vation is, that we should believe; he urges the force of "if" in Rom. 10, 9, of ἐπὶ πίστει in Gal. 2, 16, and paraphrases Gal. 3, 11: "He who is justified on account of his faith" (in the unmerited pardon of God) "shall be saved."<sup>7</sup> — His views of the relation of faith to predestination are on the same line. "For those, concerning whom He foresaw that they would belong to His people, He appointed a glory, etc. . . . We shall know, when the event arrives, what God foresaw concerning us; and until then it is enough for us to know, and of this we may be fully convinced, that it is the most sincere and earnest will of God actually to bestow the offered salvation on all those who are called; and on the other hand, that it is necessary for us to use our utmost and untiring exertions to accomplish this earnest will of God, in the attainment of which He Himself cooperates in the most active manner (2 Pet. 1, 3); and that our exertions must be continued even after we have attained a distinguished grade among the pious (ἐκλεκτοί in the more specific sense), and have made progress in the path of holiness. If we have not this conviction, we shall be in danger of being discouraged, or of falling into doubts as to our salvation, or of being indolent or indifferent, and thus, perhaps, not perform the condition on which our salvation is suspended. If we do submit to the condition on which alone God is willing to save us, and persevere unto the end, it will appear that God foresaw that we should continue in the faith and attain the promised salvation." And so as to leave no doubt that he holds the *intuitu fidei finalis*-view of predestination, the author adds: "But the reason why we fulfill or neglect to fulfill the condition appointed by God is not *because* God foresaw that we would do so."<sup>8</sup>

In Sec. 69 the author defends the thesis: "Faithful obedience to the dictates of conscience is, in adults, the condition of participation in the salvation purchased by Christ;" in Sec. 72 the thesis: "The salvation of those to whom a

---

7) Ibid., pp. 565 ff.

8) Ibid., pp. 409. 411.



divine revelation was given, is suspended on their faithfulness in the use of it."<sup>9)</sup>

The origin of faith is veiled in much obscurity in the author's account of Biblical teaching. Neither in what he says on the subject of the call, nor of repentance, nor on the influences of divine grace do we find a clear, unqualified statement that faith, as Luther says, "is a divine work in us." It is plainly synergistic teaching when the author (p. 559) says: "Nor are those religious feelings which by the divine aid are excited and cherished within us for the purpose of assisting us in our conflict with the sinful propensities of our nature, either independent of our knowledge of divine truth, or contrary to the principles of our moral nature. On the contrary, they are in perfect accordance with our religious knowledge, and are in one respect within the power of man; he can cherish and obey them, and act in conformity to those views of religious truth (Matt. 13, 23. 19) with which they are connected (Rom. 8, 4. 13), or by a different course of conduct he can neglect and suppress them." In a Lutheran compend of Biblical Theology it is certainly startling to find the following: "It is not an objectionable phraseology to say that our salvation is bestowed on man in consequence of his change of mind and reformation of life, or, that it is the reward of his reformation." The virus is not extracted from this un-Lutheran and un-Christian statement by the sentence which follows: "But faith, and the reformation of life necessarily connected with it, which is certainly the condition on which an undeserved salvation is graciously bestowed on man, must by no means be regarded as the meritorious cause of this salvation."<sup>10)</sup> To preach salvation by grace thus is simply to render every genuine conception of grace chimerical and ridiculous.

One is led to question whether the author is really in earnest in teaching a necessity of faith in Christ, when reading the following: "Those who lived before Christ (or since

9) Ibid., pp. 395. 402.

10) Ibid., p. 588 f.

that time), and yet knew nothing of a Redeemer, will doubtless partake of that salvation purchased for every individual of the human family, if they have only cherished a faith in God as far as their circumstances rendered it possible, and acted in obedience to the dictates of this faith. Nor will the fact that they knew nothing of this atonement prevent its application to them." "That unbelief, ἀπιστία, which (according to John 3, 18. 36; Mark 16, 16) subjects its possessor to the sentence of damnation, is not even possible with those who have never heard the Gospel. John 15, 22; Rom. 10, 14. And those passages themselves presuppose in the unbeliever an acquaintance with the Gospel. Comp. John 3, 19. 32—34; Mark 16, 15; John 6, 40; 14, 21. . . . Rom. 8, 29, etc., does not exclude those who have not been called, from the hope of salvation. This remark, combined with Illustration X and §§ 69. 72, form a reply to the objection which has been urged to the Christian religion: 'that the ethical system of Jesus appears to degenerate into a narrow particularism (sectarianism), by teaching that we must first believe in Jesus Himself, in order to become truly reformed and acceptable to God and eternally happy.' And it likewise affords an answer to the question, 'What are the prospects of those who never had an opportunity to hear Jesus? Are they incapable of any virtue truly acceptable to God? And what is the situation of those who have indeed heard of Jesus, but have been unable, though sincere in their inquiries, to convince themselves of some of the doctrines which He taught, *e. g.*, relative to His person? Is faith in theoretical doctrines anything of a meritorious nature?"<sup>11)</sup> A view such as this is sufficiently broad to be mistaken, at least, for Universalism.

Strange, too, in a Lutheran, is what the author says in the chapter on "Influences of Grace." We meet here with the well-known distinction of enthusiasm. "The Scriptures clearly distinguish between the influence of the doctrines and the direct or immediate influence of God. 1 Cor. 3, 6. 7: 'I have planted,

11) Ibid., pp. 395. 400.

Apollos watered, but God gave the increase,' etc. Here the divine influence (*ὁ θεὸς αὐξάνων*, God gave the increase) is distinguished from the labors of the preachers ('planting' and 'watering') and, consequently, from the doctrines themselves, and the influence of God on the preaching. Phil. 2, 12. 13: 'Labor at the salvation of others with modesty and respect for them' (?), *φρόνη καὶ τρόμῳ*,—for their salvation is not the fruit of your labor alone; but God must also exert an influence on them before they are willing and able to obey the doctrines of the Gospel; it is God that worketh in you both to will and to do (accomplish). In 2 Thess. 2, 15—17, the agency of God and Christ is distinguished from the influence of the apostolical doctrines (vv. 16. 17), Eph. 3, 16, that He (the Father) would grant unto you according to the riches of His glory to be strengthened with might (powerfully strengthened) by His Spirit in the inner man. Even if this passage did not attribute the strengthening of the heart to the Spirit, in an immediate manner; if it described this effect merely as a mediate one, through the instrumentality of the Word, still it would clearly inculcate an influence distinct from the Word; for it contains a prayer to God, that He might co-operate with the Word (which was previously known), and render it effectual in confirming the heart. But a comparison of the 20th verse with ch. 1, 19 renders it probable that the words 'strengthened with might,' *δυνάμει χρισταιωθῆναι*, refer to some internal influence of God, which internal influence produced faith in the Christians of those days (1, 19), and is still operative in the hearts of believers (3, 20), through the Holy Spirit. Rom. 8, 9. 11. 14. 16; 5, 5."<sup>12)</sup>

In Sec. 105 the author defends the thesis: "The commixture of good and bad in the Church does not justify us in seceding from it." In the course of the discussion he approaches the question of the necessity of church discipline, and says: "Although it is impossible entirely to prevent the occurrence of snares (offenses, Luke 17, 1), they are to be

12) Ibid., p. 554 f.



avoided as much as possible, for Paul, when speaking of the incestuous person, tells us that a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump (1 Cor. 5, 6); and Christ reproved the pastors or angels of the churches of Pergamus and Thyatira for tolerating certain seducers, Rev. 2, 6. 14. 20. Nevertheless, every individual Christian is to beware, lest he arrogate to himself an authority which belongs only to the Church and not to individuals, 1 Cor. 5, 2. 13. The incestuous person was condemned, not by an individual, but by the majority of the church members (who coincided with Paul in opinion); and Paul says (2 Cor. 2, 6): 'Sufficient unto such an one is the punishment which was inflicted by many.' Let no one make encroachments on the regulations of the church, but, 1 Cor. 14, 33, let all things be done decently and in order. (11, 16.) There are indeed certain measures which an individual may take, such as exhortation (1 Thess. 5, 14; 2 Thess. 3, 15) and shunning intercourse with unworthy members of the church (v. 14; 1 Cor. 5, 9—11); but those measures must not be taken in an irregular manner (Matt. 7, 6; Eph. 5, 16; comp. Col. 4, 5 and 6), or at an unseasonable time, or in such a way as shall interfere with the jurisdiction of the civil government. The civil government is now so intimately interwoven with the Church that we cannot judge everything by the standard of the ancient Christian Church, which had no connection with the government of the state, and therefore, could have more efficient internal regulations, without being in danger of interfering with civil liberty and rights. It is the duty of the Church to counteract all evils as far as possible, and, in short, to conduct all things as circumstances may dictate, so that their measures may not entail greater evils on the Church whose prosperity they were intended to subserve. Thus Paul advises the restoration of the incestuous person, because he feared that its procrastination might lead some to slander his character, by which means Satan would strive to alienate the affections of the people from him, and thereby from Christ.—In a future world, the Church

will attain the state for which she was intended, namely, that of entire purity and perfection." Witness also the author's great concern in behalf of errorists, in the following: "I admit, it is possible that those who depart from the public standard may have the more correct opinions, that, though they are considered to be in error, truth may be on their side (2 Cor. 6, 8) — I admit, that for this very reason it is the duty of those to whom the care of the Church is committed, and who are qualified for the investigation, impartially to weigh the truth and importance of the disputed doctrine, and if it be found true, to incorporate it with the acknowledged standard, or, if it seem doubtful which of the opposite opinions is more correct, to leave the adoption of either optional with the ministers of the Church."<sup>13</sup>) — Indifferentists and syncretists could easily find shelter under such views as these.

When a theologian holding views like those set forth above undertakes to "portray" Lutheranism, we would naturally expect to see a caricature. Such Dr. Schmucker has produced. We shall quote only one statement, which sufficiently characterizes the book and the man who did not blush to publish it under his official title, "First Professor in the Theological Seminary of the General Synod of the Lutheran Church, Gettysburg, Pa." Speaking of the "Progressive Development of the Lutheran Church," the author enumerates a number of "improvements." "The fifth item of improvement in the Lutheran Church is the more *systematic adjustment of her doctrines*. Luther was so incessantly employed in the great work of reforming the Church from the corruptions and superstitions of Rome that he had little leisure for abstract reflections on the reciprocal relations of the Scripture doctrines and on the entire and minute consistency of his views with each other. It is certain that in the earlier part of his life he believed the Augustinian view of predestination. His work, *On the Bondage of the Will*, published in 1525, must put this ques-

13) Ibid., pp. 500. 505.

tion to rest. But he, at the same time, entertained other views inconsistent with this. Melancthon, who had embraced Luther's unadjusted views of doctrine, led the way in the process of harmonizing their conflicting elements, by the rejection of absolute predestination. Luther himself adopted these modifications, and, long before he died, preached and taught what have ever since been the doctrines of the Lutheran standards. The particulars of this interesting process are detailed in Dr. Plank's invaluable 'History of the Rise, Changes, and Formation of the Protestant System of Doctrines.' During the reign of infidelity in Europe, when an unbaptized philosophy had desecrated the sanctuary of God, and so far effaced all lineaments and extinguished all attachment to genuine Protestant Christianity that even a Buonaparte could contemplate as a matter of state policy the reestablishment of the Romish religion over all Protestant Germany, the doctrines of great reformers were forsaken by many. But thanks be to God, the cause of truth is again prospering, orthodoxy is again preponderant in Germany; and in the Lutheran Church in this country the great doctrines of the Reformation are taught as universally as in any other denomination of Christians in our land." (This grateful reflection might seem a psychological riddle. We bear in mind that the author's view as to what are "the great doctrines of the Reformation" is altogether at variance with the view which the Lutheran Church entertains on this subject. In reality, Dr. Schmucker's expressions of grateful admiration are extremely pathetic. They show to what extent he had lost his Lutheran sensorium.)

"The sixth feature of improvement is the adoption of a more regular and rigid system of church government and discipline in this country. The union between Church and State has prevented the adoption of an independent and thoroughly Scriptural discipline in the Lutheran, as well as in all the other established churches of Europe. Kings and princes are not willing to be disciplined by humble ministers and elders. Accordingly, the systems of discipline in different provinces



and kingdoms are different, and generally very lax. In this country our General Synod has adopted and recommended a system which, it is believed, contains all the prescriptions of the Savior and His apostles, and all that appeared most valuable in the systems of the different other churches. The government and discipline of each individual church is essentially like that of our Presbyterian brethren. Our Synods, also, in the structure and powers, most resemble their presbyteries, having fewer formalities in their proceedings, and frequently couching their decisions in the form of recommendations. Our General Synod is wholly an advisory body, resembling the consociations of the Congregational churches in New England. In addition to these regular ecclesiastical bodies constituting our system of government, we have special conferences for the purpose of holding stated protracted meetings. These are subdivisions of synods, containing ordinarily from five to ten ministers each, who are annually to hold several protracted meetings within the bounds of their district. The chief object of these meetings is, to awaken and convert sinners, and to edify believers by close, practical preaching. This feature mainly resembles the quarterly meetings of our Methodist brethren, and presents to pious and zealous ministers, who are thirsting for the salvation of souls, the most direct opportunity they can desire to glorify God and advance His spiritual kingdom. Yet all these meetings are to be conducted, as the Scriptures enjoin, 'decently and in order.' This system of government is not yet adopted by all our synods; yet its general features, with perhaps a greater admixture of Congregationalism, substantially pervade those synods also which have not yet united with the General Synod." (Some time prior to writing the above the author had become "extensively known, beyond the bounds of his own church, both in America and England," by his "Fraternal Appeal" to the American churches on Christian union. So state D. Harbaugh and J. B. Butler, who wrote the preface to the edition from which we are quoting. On the 20th and 30th of March, 1854, a short

time after Dr. Schmucker's book had appeared in its sixth edition, Dr. Philip Schaff lectured at Berlin "before a select assembly of ladies and gentlemen, as part of the course of weekly lectures held there on various topics by Drs. Hofmann, Nitzsch, Stahl, Hengstenberg, Tholuck, Mueller, Schmieder, Ritter, and other distinguished scholars." Dr. Schaff's topic was: "America: A Sketch of the Political, Social, and Religious Character of the United States of North America." In the second lecture the lecturer spoke of the American churches. He related the following incident: "When the Reformed Dr. Nevin, in 1846, vindicated the Calvinistic doctrine of a real spiritual presence and a real participation by faith of the body and blood of Christ, that is, the life-power of His humanity, the editor of the *Lutheran Observer* attacked and ridiculed this view as Romanizing, superstitious, and senseless. Dr. Schmucker adopts the Puritanic, essentially Zuinglian theory prevalent in America, and in a special article on this subject rejects not only the substantial, but even the dynamic or virtual presence of the human nature of the Redeemer, declaring that 'there is no real or actual presence of the glorified human nature of the Savior, either substantial or influential, nor anything mysterious or supernatural in the Eucharist.' Anywhere in Germany this would not even be called Zuinglianism, much less Lutheranism, but the purest Rationalism of common sense. Even Bretschneider and Wegscheider leave as much as this of that holy mystery of faith, that center of the Christian worship. But in America the lowest and coldest views of the sacraments and the church are not seldom joined with orthodoxy," etc. In the same lecture the speaker administered to American Lutherans this rebuke, uttered in the presence of European Lutherans: "The Lutheran Church has an important calling in the New World. This it cannot fulfill by being unfaithful to its genius and history, and casting away its doctrinal and practical peculiarities." pp. 187 f. 194. *Sapienti sat!*) — We return to the "Portraiture." "The last item of improvement to which we shall refer

is the practice of the Lutheran Church in this country not to bind her ministers to the minutiae of any human creed. The Bible, and the belief that the *fundamental doctrines* of the Bible are taught in a manner substantially correct in the Augsburg Confession, is all that is required. On the one hand, we regard it as certain that, if we would be faithful to the injunction of our text, 'not to receive any who come to us bringing another doctrine,' an examination of applicants for admission among us is indispensable. Such an examination is virtually a requisition of their creed, that we may compare it with our own. Now, whether the articles to which we require their assent be few or many, be written or oral, they are a creed, and obviously its reduction to paper presents some material facilities in the examination. A written creed, therefore, seems necessary to the purity of the Church. On the other hand, history informs us that for several hundred years after the days of the apostles no other creed was used in the whole Church than that called the Apostles' Creed, because admitted by all to contain the principal doctrines taught by the apostles. This creed embodied only the cardinal doctrines of the Gospel, which all the so-called orthodox denominations of the present day do actually believe; and yet the assent to these few doctrines did for centuries after the apostolic age secure admission to any and every part of the Catholic, that is, the universal, Church on earth. By what authority, then, did the several Protestant denominations after the Reformation adopt creeds ten and, some of them, a hundred times as long as that used in the earlier ages, and require assent to these interminable instruments as a condition of admission to their churches? The Bible certainly enforces no such authority. But does the experience of three centuries prove their influence to be salutary? Have they not rather been the occasion of endless strife in all the churches adopting them? Have they not proved wedges of dissension to split asunder the body of Christ? It is a matter of historical certainty that the orthodox denominations of the present day coincide as much in



doctrinal views as did the Christians in the golden age of Christianity. If they could walk together in love, and their minor differences created no difficulties then, why should not Christians in the present day unite in the same manner, instead of rending the body of Christ asunder, creating separate and conflicting interests among brethren in Christ, alienation and prosecutions for minor differences, which would not have been noticed in the apostolic, and primitive, and purest age of the Church? The duty of all parts of the Christian Church seems therefore to be to return to the use of shorter doctrinal creeds as tests of ecclesiastical, ministerial, and sacramental communion. This noble course the Lutheran Church has already virtually taken, by requiring assent only to the fundamental doctrines of the Augsburg Confession, together with an approval of our principles of government and worship. This course cannot fail to promote brotherly love and fraternal appreciation between different denominations, by giving prominence to their actual unity in doctrine, and restoring a proper unity of spirit among the disciples of Christ. Happy, thrice happy, too, is the Lutheran Church, that she, who was first to cast off the yoke of Roman superstition and oppression, should lead the way in breaking the bonds of Protestant sectarianism: be first in practically teaching the world that the apostolic injunction to 'receive a brother that is weak in the faith, but not for the purpose of doubtful disputation,' does not mean to prosecute and expel him. And happy are all in every denomination who raise their voice in behalf of the lacerated body of Christ, and teach Christians to remember the solemn injunction of the Savior to love one another, and not only to profess, but to practice the principle of our blessed Lord, 'One is our Master, Christ, and ye are all brethren.'—Such, my brethren, are the features of the Lutheran Church, of that church to whose service this chaste and beautiful edifice has been dedicated," etc.<sup>14)</sup>

14) Portraiture of Lutheranism, in *The American Lutheran Church*, historically, doctrinally, and practically delineated. 6th ed., pp. 65 ff.

The man whose theological position we have sketched in his own words was, at the time of Walther's arrival, the leading instructor of Lutheran students of theology. He was in his day what Walther became later.<sup>15)</sup> If the Lutheran Church in America ever was on the verge of ruin, it was when her fortunes were entrusted to Dr. Schmucker. Rationalism, synergism, enthusiasm, syncretism — all found a spokesman in him. There is a fine sarcasm in Dr. Schaff's remarks before his audience at Berlin, when, speaking of Dr. Schmucker, he says: "The leader of the Low-church American Lutheranism, though he has translated Storr's Dogmatic into an English abridgment, and has studied the Supranaturalistic literature of Germany, is, in his theology, properly altogether Anglo-American, partly after the Puritanic Presbyterian stamp, partly after the Methodist, which appears in his Pelagianizing views of the freedom of the will and his theory of conversion and regeneration; but he would feel highly insulted to be classed with the German Rationalists, since he holds the divinity of Christ, as well as the divine inspiration and authority of the Holy Scriptures (?), as fundamental articles of faith. He has also endeavored to show that almost all the leading men of the Lutheran Church of America had no higher views of the sacraments than himself, and that even in the old Pennsylvania Synod very few rose above the Zuinglian theory, which may certainly, till within a few years, (!) have been the case."<sup>16)</sup> A Melancthonian, as regards doctrine and polity, a Plankian, as regards the history of Lutheran dogma, an ardent admirer of Mosheim and Reinhard — such was Dr. Schmucker, the genius of American Lutheranism about the middle of the nineteenth century, the unavowed author of the "Definite Platform," which purported to be the Augsburg Confession as understood by American Lutherans.

Night had lowered on the Church of the Reformation in America. Her children were weeping and wishing for the day to come. Editor Spielmann of the *Lutheran Standard* was

15) Dr. Spaeth in PRE3, 17, 664 f.

16) America, etc., p. 188.

bowing his head in shame at the disgrace of his church. He called upon his readers to put on sackcloth and ashes, and to beseech God to keep the Lutheran Church from utter dissolution.<sup>17)</sup>

Yes, it was high time that the Lord should "take pity on the Lutheran Church of America," and raise up the spokesman for her who would speak her true mind to her countrymen.

(*To be concluded.*)

## THE RISE OF ANTICHRIST.

Tu regere imperio populos, Romane, memento,  
Hæc tibi erunt artes. — *Aeneis*, VI, 852. 853.

(*Concluded.*)

Towards the end of 1299 a rumor spread through the Western world that every one visiting St. Peter's at Rome on the first day of the new century would thereby get full forgiveness of all his sins. Dante uses the vast crowds with gold that crowded Rome as an illustration of the great numbers he met in the Inferno. The Pope vainly searched the archives for any basis for the rumor. But a man 107 years old told the Pope his father had been to Rome hundred years before for the jubilee and its indulgence. Splendid! What more would you? Pope Boniface VIII, accordingly, issued a bull granting a plenary indulgence, which was to be repeated every hundredth year. Every Roman who for thirty days that year, and every pilgrim who for fifteen days, would visit the churches of St. Peter and St. Paul reverently, penitently, and with confession, should receive full remission of sins. "Not only full, but fuller, yea, the fullest forgiveness of all his sins."

A hundred years seemed a long time between such golden harvests, and so Pope Clement VI, in 1343, decreed a jubilee every fifty years. Even fifty is quite too long for some, and so Pope Urban VI, 1378—1389, reduced the time to thirty-three years, and Paul II to twenty-five.

17) *Lutheran Standard*, vol. 3, No. 52, quoted in *Der Lutheraner*, vol. 2, p. 56.



In 1296 Boniface VIII declared the Pope had supreme control over all church property in the world. (*Angl. Br.*, 245.)

On November 18, 1302, he issued the famous bull "Unam Sanctam," embodied in the Canon Law, in which he sums up the claims of the Pope to supremacy over the state, adding that the Church cannot have two heads, for otherwise she would be a "monster." "Feed my lambs," we hear once more. Jeremiah witnesses: "See, I have this day set thee over the nations and over the kingdoms." Paul testifies: "He that is spiritual judges all things; yet he himself is judged of no man." The theory of the two swords is spun out at length, and he closes with the statement of Aquinas: "We declare, say, define, and pronounce it to be necessary to salvation, that every human creature be subject to the Roman pontiff." (Emil Reich, *Sel. Doc.*; Wylie, 100; Gieseler; Krueger, 125; Janus, 254; Thompson.) This is the pinnacle of papal pretensions, expressed "ex cathedra."

In 1312 the Earl of Lincoln on his deathbed complained that "the Church of England, once honorable and free, is now, alas, enslaved by the oppressions of Rome." (*Angl. Br.*, 281.)

Pope John XXII, who died 1334, published a price list of dispensations for various crimes. The systematic compilation of this list dates from Alexander VI, 1654. (*Real-encyc.* I, 94.)

Pope Victor III, 1085—1087, paved the way for indulgences, and Alexander of Hales († 1245) furnished the material by his theory of a treasury of superfluous good works earned by Christ, Mary, and the saints.

Pope Clement VI, in 1343, sanctioned the new doctrine and reserved for the Pope the privilege of managing this new treasury. How did he manage it? From 1471 to 1820 no fewer than forty-seven impressions of the "Taxes of the Roman Chancery" were printed; here are a few items of this price list of sins:—

	£.	s.	d.
17. For simony, or fornication of priests.....	36	9	6
22. For keeping concubine .....	4	5	6
28. For murder by bishop, abbot, etc.....	50	12	6
34. For murder of father, mother, brother, wife.....	4	1	6

Gibbon says at the Pope's Jubilee "Two priests stood day and night with rakes in their hands to collect, without counting, the heaps of gold and silver that were poured upon the altars." (Preston, 300—309.)

Remember Tetzels and his bargain sale of indulgences! Some of the proceeds went to build St. Peter's at Rome, which cost about \$50,000,000.

The *Catholic Dictionary* says: "Down to the Middle Ages the faithful usually received the Eucharist under both kinds." Leo I, 440, and Gelasius, 490, expelled the Manichaeans from fellowship for receiving the bread only. The Council of Clermont, 1095, and Paschal II, 1118, condemned it as "a human and novel institution . . . departure from what Christ, the Master, ordained and did." Yet the Council of Constance, in 1415, forbade wine to communicants. (Dearden, 168.)

Boniface IX, who died 1404, knocked down vacant offices to the highest bidder, keeping the money of those who had offered less.

About the time of Martin V, 1417—1431, the representative at Rome of the Knights of the Teutonic Order wrote to his superior: "Dear Master, send me money, for at this court all friendship ceases when the cash is gone," and Canon Hemmerlin of Zurich complained that "Benefices were sold in Rome as publicly as pigs in the market." (Krueger, 130. 138.)

A man might be a cardinal at Rome, a bishop in Germany, an archbishop in England, something else in several other places. Of course, he could not live at all these places, but for his absence and yet taking the income he had to pay the Pope a yearly tax. (*Realencyc.* I, 95.)

While at Rome, Luther learned of one man who had twenty-two parishes, seven provostries, and forty-two prebends! (Hausrath's *Luther* I, 86.)

Leo X created 1200 new offices that brought him in 900,000 scudi, so that there were 2150 offices bringing him a yearly income of 320,000 scudi. (Schick, 271.)

Guicciardini, a high official of the Medicean Popes, describes in his *Ricordi* how a bishopric was bought in Rome

for a fixed sum, and this was the usual provision for the younger son of an aristocratic family. His relative, Rinieri Guicciardini, bought the See of Cortona of the Pope for 4000 ducats. (Janus, 365.)

The usual bulls for Cranmer's consecration, eleven in all, cost 6000 ducats, and the annates cost 10,000 more. (A. B., 332.)

At the beginning of the sixteenth century the See of Mainz became vacant three times in ten years. Each time the vacancy was filled 14,000 ducats had to be paid to Rome. When, in 1514, Albert of Brandenburg was confirmed as Archbishop of Mainz and Magdeburg, and Administrator of Halberstadt, an additional charge of 10,000 ducats was demanded for the holding, illegal in itself, of the last-mentioned office, together with the See of Mainz. Thus altogether about \$125,000 was demanded. Rome proposed to cede to him the sale, in his diocese, of the indulgences, in order to pay off the 29,000 florins he owed the Fuggers and to divide the net profits equally. (Krueger, 162.)

In 1439 the Council of Florence officially adopted the seven sacraments.

"Pontifex Maximus" was adopted by Paul III, 1464—1471.

"To thee is given all power in heaven and in earth," said the Lateran Council to Pope Leo X, who says: "We, with the approbation of the present holy council, do renew and approve that holy constitution"—the "Unam Sanctam" of Boniface VIII. And Baronius says: "There can be no doubt of it but that the civil principality is subject to the sacerdotal, and that God hath made the political government subject to the dominion of the spiritual church."

God hath made the Pope to be "prince over all nations, that he may pluck up, overthrow, disperse, destroy, plant, and rear. . . . We deprive the Queen" (Elizabeth of England) "of her pretended right to the kingdom, and of all dominion, dignity, and privilege whatsoever, and absolve all the nobles,



subjects, and people of the kingdom, and whoever else have sworn to her, from their oath, and all duty whatsoever in regard of dominion, fidelity, and obedience." So wrote Pope Pius V in his Bull against the English Queen.

History gives us a list of 64 emperors and kings deposed by the Popes. (Wylie, 101. 102.)

The 16th century saw the rise of the "Congregations" — committees of cardinals for various purposes. In 1542 the Congregation of the Inquisition was instituted. Paul V, 1605—1621, added the Congregation of the Index of Prohibited Books. In the 11th century Gregory VII began to send legates, direct representatives of the Pope. In the 16th century nuncios were introduced. Gregory XV, 1621—1623, organized the Congregation of the Propaganda. The first time a bishop called himself such "by the grace of the Roman Court" we find in 1520. (Schick, 116. 286.)

"Vicar of Christ" was formerly a title common to all bishops, and its modern limitation to the Roman Pope was protested even in the Council of Trent. (Lit., *P. C.*, 205.)

Up to the suppression of the smaller Religious Houses, in 1536, over 1200 monasteries had been built in England, of which about 150 paid subsidies to their parental houses in France or Italy amounting to \$300,000 yearly between 1327 and 1377. All these Houses regarded the will of the Pope as supreme over King, Church, and State. They were papal forts dotting the kingdom. (*Angl. Br.*, 249.)

The Spanish Cardinal Pacheco regretted that only few Fathers were present at Trent (180 at best), and then often absent from the council. Even the Jesuit Cardinal Pallavicino is forced to confess in numberless passages of his History that the Popes, either directly or through the legates, emperors, and princes, brought pressure to bear on the Fathers of the Council. Even Cardinal Borromeo, the Pope's nephew and secretary, admonished the three legates not to expect everything from Rome, lest the Fathers should have reason to believe that not they, but the Pope alone, was the council. Bishop Martelli of

Fiesole rose to say, with great force: "Not only were they not allowed freely to manifest their opinions and decisions, but, while discussing, they were shut up in private meetings, as if in so many jails." Those who spoke freely were styled "heretics, ill-bred, fools, rascals," and worse, according to the *Diary* of Angelo Massarelli, secretary of the council. The French Ambassador Lansac said the Holy Ghost arrived from Rome at Trent in the mail of the legates. (Bartoli, 236—265.)

The Council of Trent confirmed the teaching of the scholastics as to penance. Trent also made marriage a sacrament, though Durandus, Peraldus, Jacobus a Vitriaco in the previous century, and even Erasmus opposed it.

For 1200 years the form of absolution was that of a prayer, as in the Greek Church; but the Council of Trent defines it as "a *judicial* act, by which the priest as judge passes sentence on the penitent." (Dearden, 120.)

St. Bernard wrote: "Thou art as strong to justify as Thou art to pardon. Wherefore whosoever, smitten with compunction for his sins, hungers and thirsts after righteousness, let him believe on Thee who justifiest the ungodly: and being justified by faith alone, he will have peace with God." (Swete's *England v. Rome*, quoted in Dearden, 185.) — Yet Trent condemned and cursed justification by faith alone.

At Trent, in 1545, none of the thirty bishops knew Hebrew, few Greek; yet they canonized the Apocrypha. They also placed tradition on a level with the Bible, and Abbé Migne's "The Catholic Tradition" amounts to 220 thick volumes! When they spoke of depriving the Pope of the right of placing bishops, Julius III, 1550—1555, cried out, "None of that; rather shall the world go to ruin!" (Hase I, 198.)

The decrees of Trent were the first to be published against the will of the Emperor and, after publication, to lack the confirmation of the Emperor and the empire. (Schick, 171.)

King Henry II of France denied it was a General Council, and called it a "convention." (Dearden, 82.)

Though Trent decreed, in the 5th chapter of the 24th session, that the Pope is to grant dispensations rarely and without a fee in matrimonial matters, the Pope, in the year 1768, granted 580 such dispensations—for 1,050,000 francs.

According to a report made to the Republic of Venice the following sums went out of that little country to Rome in ten years:—

1. 28 bulls for bishops, etc.....	5,000,000 francs.
2. 42 bulls for abbeys, etc.....	50,000 “
3. 110 bulls for pensions.....	78,000 “
4. 225 bulls for parishes.....	130,000 “
5. 127 bulls for collegiate churches.....	80,000 “
6. 45 bulls for transfers.....	12,000 “
7. 1130 indulgences, etc.....	44,500 “

(Schick, 90.)

Pope Paul IV declared the Inquisition to be the one support of the papacy in Italy. In 1558 he issued his Bull “Cum ex apostolatus officio” “Out of the plenitude of his apostolic power:” 1. The Pope, who as “Pontifex Maximus” is God’s representative on earth, has full authority and power over nations and kingdoms; he judges all, and can in this world be judged by none. 2. All princes and monarchs, as well as bishops, as soon as they fall into heresy or schism, without the need of any legal formality, are irrevocably deposed . . . and incur sentence of death. In case of repentance, they are to be imprisoned in a monastery, and to do penance on bread and water for the remainder of their life. 3. None may venture to give any aid to an heretical or schismatical prince, not even the mere services of common humanity. Any monarch who does so forfeits his dominions and property, which lapse to princes obedient to the Pope, on their gaining possession of them.

This horrible bull, which Cardinal Manning attributes to the direct inspiration of the Holy Ghost, is a deliberate and official sanction of the murder of all princes who may deny the faith and the jurisdiction of the See of Rome.

Cardinal Bellarmine writes: “The first opinion is, that the Pope has a most full power, *jure divino*, over the whole



world, in both ecclesiastical and civil affairs. The second opinion is, that the Pope's *immediate* and *direct* jurisdiction extends to ecclesiastical matters only, but that he possesses a *mediate* and *indirect* authority over temporal affairs also. This *indirect* temporal power is supreme and enables the Pope, for the welfare of the Church, to annul laws and depose sovereigns. Count de Maistre, Abbé Gosselin, and Cardinal Wiseman say, as the third opinion, that the Pope has the *direction* of the conscience of every Catholic. (Wylie, 109—111.) But what is the difference between a *director* and a *dictator*?

Sixtus V, 1585—1590, thought it high treason for Belarmine to twist the universal dominion of the papacy, set forth by Pius V, into the view that spiritual power alone belonged directly and immediately to the Pope as Pope, while temporal power, though of the most exalted kind, only belonged to him indirectly, just because of his spiritual power. He did not see that it was only a question of an extraordinarily skillful maneuver which led to the same goal by a roundabout road without contradicting too flatly the modern conception of the State, and that in practice no Jesuit would ever think of distinguishing between "direct" and "indirect." (Krueger, 194.)

Pope Urban, in 1627, in his Bull "In Coena Domini," excommunicates and curses all heretics and schismatics, as well as all who favor or defend them—all princes and magistrates, therefore, who allow heterodox persons to live in their country. It excommunicates and curses all who keep or print the books of heretics without papal permission, all—whether private individuals or universities, or other corporations—who appeal from a papal decree to a future General Council. (Janus, 385.)

"Let him alone, and let him curse! It may be that the Lord will look upon our affliction, and that the Lord will requite us good for his cursing this day," 2 Sam. 16, 11. 12.

There was a festival of the Virgin Mary as early as 430. The Annunciation is first alluded to as a festival in a canon of the Council of Toledo, about 656.

When Palestine fell into the hands of infidels, and worshippers could no longer resort to the house of the Virgin Mary at Nazareth, angels carried it across the seas on May 9, 1291; after taking three temporary resting-places, it finally settled down at Loretto, in 1295, where it drew many pilgrims and gifts. Several Popes pledged their credit to the truth of the story, and rewarded pious visitors with indulgences. To doubt the story is to deny the power and providence of God. The Protestant Ffoulkes investigated the story at Loretto and Nazareth and was convinced that it was a fraud despite the Popes. On stating his convictions to the French priest, who received Mr. Ffoulkes from the Episcopal Church into the Roman communion, the only reply was, "There are many things in the Breviary which I do not believe myself." (Salmon, *Inf.*, 197.)

When a priest of Naples took home some bones from the Roman catacombs and was distressed that his precious relics were nameless, a nun of his church had revealed to her in a dream the name and whole story of the saint, Philumena, who now outdoes the oldest one in the calendar in number of miracles she performs. This romance is circulated as truth, with the approval of the highest authorities—Pope Leo XII sanctioned her devotion and proclaimed the great saint, and Pope Gregory XVI blessed one of her images. (Salmon, *Inf.*, 198.)

At La Salette, near Grenoble, on September 19, 1846, two children minding cows on a lonely mountain saw a fine lady robed in yellow dress, who said she was the Virgin Mary. The matter became known, pilgrims crowded to the place, chapels arose, hotels were opened, medals were struck, the wonderful water was sold, for it cured disease and converted sinners.

Cardinal Newman's friend and diocesan, Bishop Ullathorne of Birmingham, published an account of his visit, professing full belief in the reality of the miracle. He opened, at Stratford-on-Avon, a chapel to Our Lady of La Salette,

and introduced the Confraternity of La Salette into his diocese. By a Brief of August 26, 1852, the Pope gave a plenary indulgence to visitors to La Salette, besides other privileges. Ullathorne's priest, Wyse, writes: "In matters of faith God loves a cheerful giver. He is not pleased with those who seek what is the very minimum of belief which will secure their salvation. In these days of infidelity, supernatural faith, cultivated for safety's sake to the very utmost, is the only security against the vilest errors."

Other Catholics declared the whole thing a fraud, that the "Virgin Mary" was one Constance Lamerlière, a nun, half knave, half crazy. She was forced to bring an action for defamation of character; the court decided against her; on appeal the decision was confirmed.

On February 11, 1858, at Lourdes, in Gascony, while picking up dry wood, Bernadette Soubirous, a poor girl of fourteen, saw a beautiful lady in white with a blue sash, who said, "I am the Immaculate Conception," and invited the girl to drink at a fountain. Seeing no fountain, the girl scraped away some earth with her hands, and water came out which now supplies millions of bottles for effecting wonderful cures. The bishop sanctioned the miracle, and pilgrims crowded thither. The miracles worked by the prayers of Our Lady of Lourdes ought to banish all doubts.

Shortly after the pilgrimages to Lourdes, others were organized to Paray-le-Monial, where Marguerite Marie Alacoque, at the end of the seventeenth century, saw, for instance, our Lord's heart in His bosom burning as in a furnace, and her own heart placed as a small atom of fire in that furnace. Pope Pius IX beatified her and sanctioned the devotion to the Sacred Heart of Jesus, now so very popular.

John Wiclif wrote: "The monk is a corpse risen from the grave, who, covered with graveclothes, is set by the devil to rove about in the world." The proverb runs, "What the devil shrinks from doing, a monk does without shrinking." Another, "What the devil cannot accomplish, he hires a Jesuit to do." (Hase II, 51. 84.)



The Lateran Council of 1215 compelled auricular confession of all sins at least once a year; Trent enjoins confession of mortal sins, but venial sins may be passed over in silence without any fault. Liguori sanctions the proposition that a Christian does not sin very grievously who proposes to commit every one of the venial sins. (Bain, *Devel.*, 147.)

Escobar teaches, that if men only direct aright their intention, that is, if they think not of the sin, but of the benefit flowing from it, there is nothing which they may not do with impunity. (Wylie, 457.)

You need not do what your conscience tells you is "safe" and right, if you can give any "grave" theologian's opinion to the contrary; you then follow a "probable" opinion. This is the Roman doctrine of Probability, or "Probabilism." It exists in germ in Thomas Aquinas, praised by Leo XIII and Pius X; it was developed and exploited by the Jesuits in the 17th century and exposed by Pascal's "Provincial Letters;" it is taught in the "Moral Theology" of Liguori, who died in 1787, ninety-one years old, who was made a "Doctor of the Church" by Pius IX in 1871. (Bain, *Devel.*, 142.)

The Jesuit Busenbaum says: "When the end is lawful, the means also are lawful." "He to whom the end is lawful, to him the means also are lawful." The Jesuit Layman says: "To whom the end is permitted, the means adapted to that end are permitted also." The Jesuit Wagemann says: "The end determines the rectitude of the act." (Littledale, *P. R.*, 208.)

Of the seminaries, especially of those established by Parsons in Spain, Cardinal d' Ossat wrote: "The object of these institutions is to instil into the minds of the missionaries the Spanish political creed; and for that, rather than the Catholic faith, were they, if necessary, to suffer martyrdom." (The Jesuit Taunton: *Hist. Jesuits in Engl.*, 134; Galton, 82.)

The famous Père La Chaise, writing to Father Petre in 1688, says that Aquaviva, the General of the Jesuits, allowed Parsons to support the claims of King Philip; and another agent, Creighton, to support the succession of King James VI,

"so that the Society should be on the winning side, whether James or Philip won." (Galton, 78.)

Innocent XI condemned mental reservation, or restriction in all cases, and yet Liguori permits "non-pure" for a just cause. (Bain, *Devel.*, 150.) Innocent XI set himself against the ethics of most Jesuit schools. (Lord Acton in *London Times*, Nov. 24, 1874.)

The Dominican Melchior Canus of Salamanca calls the Jesuits the "forerunners of Antichrist." Paolo Sarpi, the learned Servite monk of Florence, said in 1611: "When the Jesuits are destroyed, Rome will go down, and when Rome is lost, religion will renew itself." (Schick, 249. 250.)

Paul IV doubted even the orthodoxy of Loyola—whose extravagant mysticism for a time rendered him suspect to the Inquisition—and as a politician he did not trust him the width of the road. He even withdrew pecuniary support from the order and thereby placed Ignatius in great difficulties. (Krueger, 184.)

Sixtus V was inspired by the right feeling when he found himself unable to conquer his dislike for the order. (Krueger, 197.)

In 1759 the King of Portugal "issued a decree of banishment against the Jesuits as traitors, rebels, enemies to, and aggressors on, his person, his states, and the public peace and the general good of the people." One of the Jesuit plotters was burned alive by the Dominicans, and the other two were condemned to imprisonment for life. (The Roman Catholic Cermenin, in *History of the Popes* II, 392; in Thompson's *Footsteps of the Jesuits*, 218.)

King Charles III expelled the Jesuits from Spain. Parma, Naples, Milan, and Venice followed suit.

The Parliament of Paris appointed a commission of five Princes of the Blood, four Peers of France, seven Presidents of Courts of Justice, thirteen Councillors, and fourteen other officials to examine the works of no less than 147 Jesuit writers, and this committee found the Jesuits guilty of "authorizing

Theft, Lying, Perjury, Impurity, all Passions and all Crimes: of teaching Homicide, Parricide, and Regicide, and of substituting Superstition for Religion by favoring Magic, Blasphemy, Irreligion, and Idolatry."

By the edicts of April and August, 1762, with the consent of the King, the Parliament closed the Jesuit colleges, confiscated their property, and expelled them, about four thousand, from France, and declared their order inadmissible in any civilized state.

When Louis XV tried to get a reform of the Jesuits from their general, Ricci replied, "Sint ut sunt, aut non sint."

The Jesuits were banished to the Pope's lands—"the soil of Italy was polluted by this unclean slime which the nations had rejected, and which they had sent back to Rome, the fountain of all corruptions," writes the Romanist Cermenin. (Thompson, *Footsteps*, 222.)

Pope Clement XIII tried to protect them, but complained in powerless wrath, "The Vicar of Christ was treated like the lowest of mortals." (Krueger, 208.)

When he promised the sovereigns that "he would pronounce the abolition of the society in a public consistory," the night before the day appointed the Pope suddenly died. "The Jesuits had poisoned him," is the terse word of the Catholic Cermenin. (Thompson, *Footsteps*, 224.)

Pope Clement XIV, after long hesitation, at length, on July 21, 1773, issued the Bull "Dominus ac Redemptor noster," by which he suppressed the order in all parts of the world. The Pope says in the Bull that all attempts to reform the order had failed, and that its total suppression was needful for the peace and prosperity of the Church. The bull forbids under severe penalties that it should "ever be rescinded, glossed, or its meaning modified or explained away."

Pope Clement XIV struck a medal in honor of the dissolution of the Jesuits. On the face is a picture of the Pope with the words, "Clemens XIV. Pontif. Max.;" the reverse shows Christ, followed by Peter and Paul, driving forth three



Jesuit priests, with the legend, "I never knew you: depart from me, all of you!"

Clement said to a friend: "At last the suppression is accomplished. . . . I do not regret it, and were it not already done, I would do it now. *Ma questa suppressione mi sara la morte* (But this suppression will be my death)."

It was whispered the Pope would not live out the year. He died on September 22, 1774, after terrible sufferings and in the most horrible condition. The Romans all said, "The Jesuits have done this." (*Our Brief*, 246—248.)

A post mortem examination of his body revealed the presence of poison, as was reported to his Government by the Spanish ambassador, then at Rome. (Thompson, *Footsteps*, 228.)

Pius V, 1779—1799, could not be elected till he had reassured the Bourbon courts on the Jesuit question. (Krueger, 210.)

Only forty years after, in May, 1814, on his return to Rome, Pope Pius VII, by his Bull "Sollicitudo Omnium," reversed the bull of Pope Gregory XIV and restored the Jesuits.

The Roman Catholic Frenchman Lamennais said, "The Jesuits were *grenadiers de la folie*, and united imbecility with the vilest passions." (Lord Acton, *Essays on Liberty*, 464.)

Doellinger speaks of the ever-gaping wound in the reputation of the Jesuits—its moral system. (Janus, 36.)

"Jesuitism is but esoteric Catholicism made tangible." (Miss Caldwell, Baroness von Zedwitz, *The Double Doctrine of the Church of Rome*, 33. Revell.)

The Jesuits are what Gladstone calls the "Veiled prophets behind the papal throne, by whom the Latin Church is governed. These are the men who cherish, methodize, transmit, and exaggerate all the dangerous traditions of the Curia. They seem to supply that Roman malaria which Dr. Newman tells us encircles the rock of St. Peter."

To this "insolent and aggressive faction," as Cardinal Newman calls them, the Pope is mainly indebted for his infallibility in 1870.

Pope Pius IX, on December 8, 1854, solemnly proclaimed the dogma of the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin Mary. The Jesuit Schrader rightly says: "The independent definition of a dogma includes at the same time, not indeed explicitly and formally, but none the less undoubtedly and positively, another dogmatic decision, *viz.*, that of the disputed question whether the Pope is in his own person infallible in matters of faith, or whether he can claim this infallibility only at the head of a council." (Krueger, 237.)

At Whitsuntide, 1862, Pius IX assembled his cardinals and hundreds of bishops and canonized the twenty six martyrs who perished in the persecution of Japan in 1597, and hoped thereby to gain new intercessors with God.

In March, 1864, the Pope addressed a brief to the Archbishop of Munich, in which he declared that the opinions of Catholic writers were subject to the authority of the Roman congregations.

On December 8, 1864, the Pope issued his "Quanta Cura" with the syllabus of eighty condemned propositions.

In the Bull "Aeterni Patris Unigenitus," Pius IX called the Vatican Council. Of the 750 Fathers the non-Italians did not number 300, whereas the 450 others were either Italians or dependent directly on the Pope for their living or on the *Propaganda Fide*. Pius IX, moreover, gave free lodging to some 180 poor Fathers, who repaid his hospitality by shouting for the infallibility. Dupanloup wrote or inspired the pamphlet "La Situation des Choses à Rome," proving that the Pope tyrannized the council, which, against the protest of almost all learned Catholics, voted to declare the Pope infallible.

In the Constitution "Pastor Aeternus" Pius IX decreed his personal infallibility, on July 18, 1870, and thereby declared that no Pope had ever erred.

The Romanist Thomas Canon Pope pp. 11—15 of his "Council of the Vatican" insists that the Church has the right to intrude "into the social relations of the general community

of worldlings," and has also the right to supervise the lectures of the professor, the diplomacy of the statesman, the government of kings, and to scrutinize their morality and punish their faults. (Thompson, *Footsteps*, 430—432.)

Hadrian II, in an allocution to the Roman Synod, in 869, says: "We read that the Roman Pontiff has pronounced judgments on the prelates of all the churches; we do not read that anybody has pronounced sentence on him."

Nicholas, to Emperor Michael, says: "It is evident that the judgment of the Apostolic See, than which there is no authority greater, may be rejected by no one, nor is it lawful for any one to pass judgment on its judgment." These sentiments of former Popes are quoted with approval by Pope Leo XIII in his encyclicals, p. 387.

The present Pope, Pius X, upholds the old claims of the papacy, as is proved in the recent Fairbanks-Roosevelt-Vatican affair.

It cost over 100,000 florins to pronounce Loyola a saint. (Schick, 233.)

In order to *begin* the proceedings for the beatification of Joan of Arc, Bishop Dupanloup gave Pope Pius IX 300,000 francs; his successor, Cardinal Coullie, gave to Pope Leo XIII 160,000 francs; Princess d' Estinac gave 260,000 francs; the diocese of Orleans gave 118,000 francs in 1904; English Catholics raised 200,000 francs—1,038,000 francs to *begin* the proceedings to call the Maid of Orleans "blessed"! To this pretty penny add the sums that all the other, many other, saints have sent to Rome!

In 1874 rules prohibiting abuses in the traffic of masses were issued. These had to be renewed by the Sacred Council on May 25, 1893: "Since in these last years it is plain that these salutary rules have often been neglected . . . and that abuses have prevailed largely and widely in this matter," etc. (Dearden, 174.)

The Spanish Government in the Philippines derived a revenue of nearly \$300,000 a year from the sale of indulgences,

which it sold over the same counter with tobacco, brandy, lottery tickets, and other articles, of which the Government retained the monopoly. (Bain, *Devel.*, 71.)

Pope Leo XIII, in his encyclical Letter "Satis Cognitum," of June 20, 1896, says: Cut off from the Catholic Church a man becomes a heretic. Separated from the Catholic Church a man is united to an adulteress. (p. 358.)

Replying to the "Association for Promoting the Unity of Christendom," Cardinal Patrizzi says, with the authority of the Holy Office, dated Rome, November 8, 1865: "Whosoever is separated from the one and only Catholic Church, however well he may believe himself to live, by this one sin of separation is in a state of wrath . . . out of which is neither salvation nor entrance into the kingdom of heaven." (Dearden, 61.)

St. Augustine says: "Those who are unjustly excommunicated are crowned of God in secret."

As "Universal Bishop," successor of Peter, Prince of the Apostles, the Pope claims sole right to make and unmake bishops, and absolute rule over every bishop and archbishop throughout the world.

In the oath of allegiance to the Pope the bishop-elect swears to remain faithful to the Holy See, and to extend and promote the rights, privileges, and powers of the See of Peter, and to persecute and fight all heretics and schismatics to the utmost of his ability, and undertake to visit Rome at stated intervals, and whenever specially summoned, and to give an account to the Pope of his whole pastoral office. (*Our Brief*, 42—44; Carl Mirbt, *Quellen z. Gesch. d. Papsttums*, 2. ed., 438.)

The absolute rule of the Pope may be seen from the Pastoral of Cardinal Langenieux, Archbishop of Rheims, dated July 20, 1904: "We renew our unbounded submission to the Vicar of Jesus Christ. His authority has no other limits than those which He Himself prescribes. We should consequently obey Him in everything He orders or counsels. We wish to be the first among you to practice that simple and prompt



obedience, which admits of neither hesitation nor calculation." (*Our Brief*, 44.)

In a letter to the *London Times* of August 1, 1904, the Catholic historian Dom Gasquet, O. S. B., writing as to the Pope's power "to deal directly with any individual bishop, when and how he may choose," asks: "How otherwise could any supreme spiritual authority govern the subjects who have taken an oath to obey him in all matters relating to that sphere?"

For the consequences of this papal rule carefully consider the words of Father Hyacinthe in the *London Times*, August 15, 1904: "France and Italy can only advance in proportion to their emancipation from 'this fatal servitude to a foreign power, which was never instituted by Christ, and which was unknown during the early centuries of the Church's history.'"

The Roman Catholic historian Lingard writes: "The Popes became sovereigns over sovereigns, and assumed the right of judging them in their Papal Courts, and of transferring their crowns as they thought just." (*A. B.*, 494.)

The papacy's "ideal of the Church is a universal empire spiritually, and, where it is possible, physically, ruled by a single monarch,—an empire of force and oppression, where the spiritual authority is aided by the secular arm in summarily suppressing every movement it dislikes." (*Janus, Preface*, XV.)

Gladstone writes: "Either the See and Court of Rome had . . . abandoned the dream of enforcing infallibility on the Church, or else by willful silence they were guilty of practicing upon the British Crown one of the blackest frauds recorded in history."

Cardinal Newman lamely says the Pope was no party to those declarations. Very well, but the Pope did not excommunicate those liars and perjurers! (*A. B.*, 493.)

Gladstone, in his "Vaticanism," says of the Pope's system that "its influence is adverse to freedom in the state, the family, and the individual. When weak, it is too often crafty, and when strong, tyrannical." He says it is the Pope's policy that

in "the Church of Rome nothing shall remain except an Asian monarchy,—nothing but one giddy height of despotism, and one dead level of religious subserviency."

"To assail this system is the Alpha and Omega of my desire, and it is to me a matter of regret that I am not able to handle it as it deserves without reflecting upon the persons, be they who they may, that have brought it into the world, have sedulously fed its weakness, have reared it up to its baleful maturity, have forced it upon those who now force it upon others, are obtaining for it from day to day fresh command over the pulpit, the press, the confessional, the teacher's chair, the bishop's throne." (*Anglican Brief*, 482. 483.)

"Deus vos impleat odio papae!" (Luther.)

Milwaukee, Wis.

W. DALLMANN.

## THE DOCTRINE OF ELECTION ACCORDING TO Eph. 1, 3—14.

(From Stoeckhardt's Commentary.)

The passage which we have just explained is a *locus classicus* for the doctrine of the election of grace. Accordingly, we shall present once more, in a brief conspectus, the main points of the teaching regarding the eternal election of God which the apostle has here laid before us. We shall arrange them under a number of *capita doctrinae*, by grouping together equivalent terms and statements. To this end, we reproduce an article from *Lehre und Wehre* 1905, pp. 481 ff.

1. A few introductory remarks, to begin with. The doctrine of the election of grace is one of the clear doctrines of Scripture. There is sufficient light shed on it even by this one principal *sedes doctrinae* in Eph. 1, 3—14. The elements which constitute the essence of the eternal election stand forth in this text in sharp and distinct outlines. As far as God was pleased to reveal it to us, the eternal decree of election is here presented in simple and unequivocal terms. Occasionally we meet with a few expressions that might be controverted, as,

*e. g.*, ἀναξαγκαλιώσασθαι τὰ πάντα, or ἐκκληρώθην; still, these expressions, whichever way they are explained, do not detract from the general understanding which this passage affords. The meaning which, in our opinion, is contained in ἐκκληρώθην, is attested by the unequivocal expression ἐξελέξατο ἡμᾶς. The interpretation which we have given to ἀναξαγκαλιώσασθαι τὰ πάντα is expressed, beyond a question, in the term περιποίησις, “a peculiar people” (“*Eigentumsvolk*”). The fact that the doctrine of the election of grace has actually become controverted to a great extent, both in former days and especially in our time, surely is no proof that in this instance we have before us an obscure or semi-obscure chapter of doctrine, — a chapter which, in the last analysis, is a mere problem of theology. If this were true, we should have to relegate also the article of the Holy Supper and of the divinity of Christ to the category of problems in theology. For these, too, have ever been greatly contested articles of doctrine. Theologians who have emancipated their reason from Scripture have attempted to doctor the divine mysteries, grafting some notion of theirs upon this passage and clipping something from another. These attempts do not render the respective declarations of Scripture obscure. Such a procedure can confuse only unstable and venturesome minds, but it cannot disarrange to simple minds the plain sense and understanding of the words of Scripture. To cite an instance, the manner in which the expressions ἐξελέξατο ἡμᾶς, or ἐν ᾧ τῷ, in v. 4, or πρόθεσις θεοῦ, in v. 11, are being manipulated does not throw these words which the Holy Ghost has taught into the shade, but sets them out in a strong light. These efforts show to what artifices persons must resort, in order to dodge the plain meaning of words.

2. The doctrine of the election of grace is a doctrine intended for Christians. In Eph. 1 Paul speaks to Christians and with Christians; such expressions as ἡμεῖς, ἡμῶς embrace himself and all Christians. This doctrine cannot be grasped and understood, except by penitent and believing Christians who are sanctified by the Spirit of God, and are seeking those

things which are above. Thus, the primary doctrines of sin, of the wrath of God, of justification by grace for Christ's sake through faith, of sanctification, are treated in advance of the doctrine of election in the Epistle to the Romans, that *Compendium doctrinae Paulinae*. In the Epistle to the Ephesians, which was addressed to Christians tried and true, to whom Paul had for three years proclaimed the entire counsel of God, the apostle presupposes among his readers the knowledge and the salutary understanding of these principal articles of the Christian doctrine. When dealing with persons who have not become Christians as yet, and whom we desire to convert to Christianity, we speak to them of other matters, not of the election of grace. The doctrine of the election of grace is designed for Christians, and its intended purpose is to advance and stablish Christians in their faith. It is a doctrine abounding in comfort. The entire passage Eph. 1, 3—14 is a doxology, a glorification of the blessings of God. All that we read in this passage is sweet Gospel. Elsewhere, *e. g.*, in Rom. 8, 2 Thess. 2, 1 Pet. 1, the doctrine of the eternal election is applied for the comfort of Christians under the cross, in their sufferings and afflictions. In the Epistle to the Ephesians the apostle does not allude to the sufferings of Christians. At all times, in good as well as in evil days, Christians are in need of the comfort and strengthening which this doctrine affords them.

3. In Eph. 1 the apostle occupies the present standpoint of his Christian readers. He reminds them of the blessing which they possess at present, and from these blessings he directs their glance backward to the antemundane fountain from which those blessings have flowed. He identifies himself and his fellow-Christians with the elect.

<sup>1)</sup>As regards the identification of Christians with the elect, and of the elect with Christians, I refer to the following passage in my Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans,

---

1) This paragraph is a footnote in the original. We have embodied it in the article proper because of its importance.



pp. 403. 404: "Throughout the Epistles of the apostles these terms, 'the called,' 'the saints,' 'the beloved,' 'the elect,' are used promiscuously. In our Lutheran Confessions such designations as 'the elect,' 'the Christians,' 'the children of God,' are used as interchangeable terms. When Scripture speaks of the elect, of those whom God has foreknown and predestinated, we are to think of believing Christians and are to embrace ourselves in the number of the elect. And when Scripture speaks of the Christians, of the believing children of God, we are to identify them with the elect. True, only those are elect who persevere in faith unto the end and are ultimately glorified. However, throughout the Scriptures the believing Christians are viewed and described as persons whose abiding characteristic is faith, and who obtain the end of faith, the salvation of their souls. Accordingly, in his explanation of the Third Article of the Creed, Luther defines the Christian Church, or the communion of saints, or believers, as 'entire Christendom,' whom the Holy Ghost 'calls, gathers, enlightens, sanctifies, and preserves with Jesus Christ in the one true faith.' True, we know from experience that many who had obtained faith apostatize sooner or later. Moreover, Scripture issues earnest warnings against defection from the faith, and speaks of time-believers. However, what we are to think of time-believers is written on another page in our Bible; that is a truth by itself which we are not to mingle with the declarations of Scripture concerning the election of the children of God unto everlasting life. For these declarations treat only of such persons as believe and are saved." Comp. *Lehre und Wehre* 1905, pp. 199—201: "It is apparent from the passages of Scripture and of the Confessions which were adduced above, and from many similar passages, what kind of persons are meant by the terms 'believers,' 'all believers,' viz., those whose permanent characteristic is faith, who are now in a state of faith and believe unto the end, the *finaliter credentes*. Those who for a time fall from faith and return to faith again are not specially considered in these passages. *Apropos*, when the

entire life even of these persons, from the moment of their conversion to the hour of their death, is to be passed upon in a summary judgment, they, too, must receive the predicate 'believers.' For, since they are reconverted, their former defections are remembered no more. When Scripture says: 'He that believeth, *πᾶς ὁ πιστεύων*, shall be saved,' it is plain that the expression *πᾶς ὁ πιστεύων* signifies the abiding relation and conduct of these persons toward Christ,—that relation in which they are still found when the final sentence is proclaimed which decides either a person's eternal life or death. When we confess that God 'will on the last day raise me and all the dead, and give unto me and all believers in Christ eternal life,' we refer to those who are living in a state of faith and pass through faith still believing. Aye, the term 'believers,' when unqualified, both in Scripture and our Confessions, denotes the *finaliter credentes*. This idiomatic use of the term appears not only in the particular statements of Scripture afore cited, in which eternal life is attributed to believers in curt and direct terms, but it pervades the entire Scriptures. Wherever Scripture describes the believing Christians, it characterizes them as persons who live and die in faith. In the exordium of his First Epistle the Apostle Peter embraces himself and all believing Christians in one comprehensive statement, when he says: 'Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, which according to His abundant mercy hath begotten us again unto a lively hope.' Proceeding, he characterizes the regenerate, the believers, as persons who are kept by the power of God in faith, whose faith is tried and tested by the fire of tribulation, and who receive the end of their faith, the salvation of their souls. According to Rom. 8, 15. 16, the believing Christians are children of God, who cry 'Abba, Father,' and with whose spirit the Spirit itself beareth witness that they are the children of God. Yea, 'ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus,' Gal. 3, 26. However, it is just to these children of God, to all the children of God, that the state-

ment applies: 'If children, then heirs,' Rom. 8, 17, 'heirs according to the promise,' Gal. 3, 29. In the terminology of Scripture the children of God are simply those who are now in a filial relation to God and will later obtain the inheritance of children. And the abstract term 'faith' is used in the same sense as the concrete 'believer.' Wherever Scripture commends faith, wherever it testifies that we are justified and saved by faith, it conceives of faith, just as of the righteousness of faith, as a *continuum*, as something which endures until faith passes into sight, and eternal bliss follows justification. This idiomatic use of the terms has passed over into ecclesiastical parlance. The passage in the Form of Concord which says that 'God has considered in His eternal counsel the conversion, justification, and salvation of every Christian,' defines a Christian as a person who is converted, is righteous before God, and is saved. In the Third Article of the Christian Creed we confess that the Church is the communion of saints, or of believers. This means, according to Luther's explanation, all Christendom throughout the earth, whom the Holy Ghost calls, gathers, enlightens, sanctifies, and keeps with Jesus Christ in the one true faith. Aye, also preservation in faith belongs to the concept of faith, of being a Christian, and of the Church. Indeed, Scripture speaks also of time-believers, who believe for a season and then fall away,—fall away finally and are lost, Luke 8, 13. And we shall allow no appeal to the consistency of reasoning to prompt us to the statement that the faith of time-believers is a specious faith. Time-believers actually believe; they are inwardly in touch with the Lord while they are believers. Aye, there are men who have tasted the good Word of God and the powers of the world to come, and yet fall away, Hebr. 6, 5. 6. This is a fact established by Scripture. However, it is contrary to Scripture to divide 'believers' into two classes: such as believe unto the end and are saved, and such as believe for a time, and then fall away and are lost. It is wrong to compute the number of believers thus: 1. the *finaliter credentes*; 2. the

time-believers: total: all believers. It is vulgar rationalism, and a bad attempt at conciliation, to gather the believing children of God, strictly and emphatically so called, and the time-believers into one concept, and, as is being done, to construct the idea of faith from a study of the time-believers, and in the very premises to posit the possibility of a defection as part of the concept of faith. True, every believing Christian still is in the flesh, and hence must be careful not to indulge his flesh and thus lose the Spirit. But the believer, in so far as he is a believer, knows of no defection. It is to the believer an impossible thought to imagine that his faith could ever cease. True faith is assurance, assurance of present and future salvation, an assurance which never fails. We do indeed lay to heart what Scripture says concerning the time-believers. We take them as a warning example. But we absolutely refuse to take the time-believers as our teachers and guides who are to show us what constitutes faith and how we are to believe. Those theologians who, when speaking of faith and salvation, always enter the time-believers as an element in their argumentation, should, indeed, have a care, lest they rob those whom they are teaching of the true understanding of what saving faith is. No, indeed! it is not so, that the time-believers are necessarily included in the general concept of faith. Hence the time-believers do not belong to the elect."

Thus the apostle teaches us how to view the eternal election of God *a posteriori*. Scripture, indeed, speaks elsewhere, in unqualified terms and in an objective view of the matter, of the elect whom God predestinated, of the elect as being few in number, while there are many who are called. However, wherever the apostles instruct Christians regarding the mystery of eternity, they apply what they say to those whom they are teaching. This direct and practical manner of considering the subject keeps us from useless and dangerous speculations. If you wish to think and speak correctly concerning the election of grace, you must learn, from close



observation of Scripture, also the *modus loquendi* and the correct method. There is a different ring, and there is a different impression created, whether you say that God, before the foundation of the world, has elected us unto faith, unto the adoption of sons, unto salvation; or whether you point to some undefined persons, concerning whom God decreed in eternity that He would bring them unto faith and save them.

So much it was necessary to say, in a general way, concerning the character of the doctrine which this passage invites us to consider. As regards our election, Paul now submits for our meditation on Eph. 1 the following comforting and edifying facts of our faith.

4. God has chosen us before the foundation of the world. In this statement God is the subject, and we Christians,—we who are now Christians,—are the object of the divine election. Paul knows only of an election of persons, not of an election of means. The appointment of the means of salvation, of the means of grace, is a procedure entirely different from the choosing of the elect. The election of grace is an election of persons, and that, of individuals (*“Personenwahl und Einzelwahl”*). A goodly proportion of our modern theologians reject the election of individuals, and represent the divine election as pertaining only to the Church *in genere*. However, what else is the Christian Church than the entire Christendom throughout the world, the sum total of all believing Christians? Now, all that is predicable of the total number of Christians is predicable of the individual Christians composing that number. God has chosen us, ἡμεῖς. With this term the apostle refers to himself and his Christian readers, to all his fellow-Christians; and he would have each individual Christian to consider himself embraced in this word ἡμεῖς. Election is an individualizing act. In electing, God has referred to me, aye, even to me in particular, to me individually, to me *in concreto*, to me personally. God has chosen us before the foundation of the world. Election *κατ-*

ἐξοχήν is an antemundane, eternal act of God, hence, an act of the will, a counsel, a decree, of God. Before the world was, before we existed, God, even the great, eternal God, the Lord of heaven and earth, has bestowed His attention on us, — on me, — humble and poor creatures that we are. In His reflections, in His eternal counsel and decree, He has picked us — me — from out of the world, out of the *massa perditā*, and has ordained that we are to belong to Him, that we are to be His own. What a comfort for us Christians, who are strangers in the world and often regard ourselves as a negligible cipher in this world!

5. Furthermore, Eph. 1 defines for us more closely the contents and purpose of our election. The relation into which we have been placed to God by the eternal election is called the adoption of children. God has predestinated us unto the adoption of children, *viz.*, that we were to become the children of God through Christ. Our relation to God was to be, not that of creatures, nor that of slaves or servants, nor that of friends and confidants, but that of children. He was to be our Father, and we His dear children. And being His children, we were to have our conversation before Him, holy and blamelessly, in love. God desired to be glorified among men, even here in time, by us as His children who are showing forth the praises of God to the world. Predestination unto the adoption of children, however, embraces also predestination unto the inheritance of children. Even before the foundation of the world our Heavenly Father has decreed and conveyed to us all that He possesses as the original owner, the bliss and glory of heaven. And in predestinating us unto the adoption of children and everlasting life God has at the same time, from the beginning, ordained in what manner He would bring us — me — unto justifying and saving faith, and preserve us therein. Moreover, He has preordained and prearranged all the changes of fortune in our lives in such a manner, that they must serve the attainment of the highest purpose of life, *viz.*, faith, our adoption as children, and salvation. What

love, what honor our Father in heaven has conferred on us by choosing us, before we had our being, to be His children, and by preordaining all that is included in the adoption of children!

6. We are not worthy of such love and honor. Verily, there is in us no lovable and attractive trait that could prompt, and did prompt, God to elect us. We belong by nature to the degenerate and corrupt race of men, who are an abomination to God. The reason why God, by His eternal election, chose us from out of this race of men and predestinated us that we should be His own, is not furnished in any way by our disposition or character, by our acts and conduct. This entire passage Eph. 1, 3—14 does not offer the least ground for assuming that, in electing us, God somehow took into consideration our conduct. On the contrary, these expressions: ἐξελέξατο ἡμᾶς, ἐκλογίσθημεν, εὐδοκία, πρόθεσις, bar every consideration of this kind. For these expressions represent the eternal act of the will of God as a free act, the motive for which is found exclusively in God Himself. We have been predestinated unto the adoption of children and the inheritance of everlasting life according to the good pleasure of His will, simply because it pleased God to do so. We have been predestinated to the praise of the glory of His grace, because God wished to show forth in us the glory of His grace. What prompted and moved God to elect us, us, — me, — is His grace and mercy. And that, His grace in Christ. God has elected us by Christ, whom He has foreordained before the foundation of the world to be the Redeemer of sinful men. In the eyes of God the merit of Christ has from the beginning covered our unworthiness, and has attracted to us unworthy beings the attention and good pleasure of God. These are the only causes of our eternal election: the mercy of God and the merits of Christ; the former is the *causa impulsiva*, the latter the *causa meritoria*. Verily, our eternal election rests on a firm and immovable foundation. We shall not permit ourselves to doubt it when observing how unworthy we are of being elected.

7. By grace, for Christ's sake, God has before the foundation of the world elected us, me, every single one of us, unto the adoption of children and unto everlasting life. The election of grace is an election of individuals. However, the individuals whom God has elected form a whole, *τὰ πάντα*, a people, a peculiar people, *περιποισις*. Compared to the world, the *massa perditā*, from out of which they have been elected, the elect are few in number. Still, we are not to picture to ourselves the eternal election as an act by which God picked from the wreck and ruin of the world a paltry few who are saved: but we are ever to keep before our spiritual eye the great and "noble company" of the elect children. The elect, — as many as there are, and ever were, of them in the world, — when viewed in their totality, as God views them, are seen to be a great and respectable people. This was the aim of the eternal counsel and plan of the love of God: to raise up out of the human race a great family of children of God, united and compacted in Christ, in whom they were chosen: a family on whom rests the entire good pleasure of the Father in heaven which rests on the eternal Son of His love; a family of many generations of children, *πατρίαι*, Eph. 3, 15, gathered from all nations of the earth, and showing forth, in union with the various generations of God in heaven, the holy angels, the praises of God forever and ever; yea, we add, on the strength of Eph. 3, 9, 10: an eternal Church, the *kosmos* of God and its race of men, in whom there is ultimately realized, after the destruction of the apostate world of men who refused to be saved, the purpose of God's creation, the will and good pleasure of Him who has made all things. What an honor for us to be members of this great family of God! In the communion of the elect we find abundant comfort and compensation for the contempt and repulsion which we meet in the world.

8. The eternal choice or election of God is further described in Eph. 1 by significant expressions, especially such as state the infallibility of the election. God has predesti-



nated us unto the adoption of children, and to the inheritance of children as well. However, the predestination of God is irrevocable, more so than the laws of the Medes and Persians. We are predestinated "after the counsel of His own will." God took counsel with Himself in eternity. He considered the matter and after mature deliberation reached the conclusion that we, we in particular, I myself and my fellow-Christians, were to become His children and heirs of everlasting life. Now, of the counsel of the Lord we read: "The counsel of the Lord standeth forever, the thoughts of His heart to all generations," Ps. 33, 11. We have been predestinated *κατὰ τὴν εὐδοκίαν τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ*. However, *εὐδοκία*, the good pleasure of God, as Polykarp Leyser remarks, is such that even the gates of hell and myriads of devils cannot thwart it. We have been predestinated "according to the purpose of Him who worketh all things after the counsel of His own will." Man does not, and cannot, execute all that he proposes. It is a divine prerogative to execute and to realize all that He has proposed. Thus, the purpose of the election, too, cannot fail. And what a great comfort it is to us Christians to know our adoption and salvation has not been committed to our hands, "out of which it might easily be taken and snatched, owing to the weakness and malice of our flesh and the guile and power of the devil and the world," but that God has taken our adoption and salvation into His almighty hand, and "has well secured it in His eternal purpose which cannot fail or be thwarted." God has fixed in advance the number, the sum total of the elect, *τὰ πάντα, τὸ πλῆρωμα*. And hence, not a single one can drop out of this number. Verily, then, a Christian must be glad and assured of his salvation. Such assurance of salvation is, indeed, a characteristic feature of Christian faith. Thus the comfort derived from our election serves for our edification in our most holy faith.

9. God has even now, for a good part, carried out His eternal purpose. In Eph. 1 the apostle points emphatically to the execution of the eternal counsel of God. Even to Adam,

later to Abraham and Israel, God gave the promise, and by the promise He quickened the elect from the race of Adam and Abraham to faith, to the hope of the future Christ. But God is employed in the gathering of the elect children especially in the present eon, in the time of the New Testament. He has now sent the Gospel of Christ, and many Gentiles have so far heard and believed the Gospel of their salvation and thus become the children of God. The entire work of the Church, the preaching of the Gospel, serves this purpose and has this effect, *viz.*, to gather the elect from all the ends of the earth. We, too, have heard and believed the Gospel of our salvation, and have obtained the adoption of children. The entire course of our life hitherto was a pedagogical effort of God, which aimed at our faith and adoption. We have known Christ, and in Christ we have the redemption through His blood, the forgiveness of sins; in Him we have a God who is reconciled to us, we have God for our Father. Moreover, God has blessed us with all wisdom and prudence, and thus enabled us to lead a godly life. This, however, is the exact blessing which He designed for us in eternity.

10. Accordingly, God will continue until the end to carry out His eternal counsel and purpose regarding us and our elect fellow-Christians, in order that we may reach the final goal of our predestination. We were sealed with the Holy Spirit of promise, the earnest of our future inheritance. The Holy Spirit secures to God those who are His, whom He has chosen from the beginning, and He preserves our souls and keeps them steadfast in the Word and faith until the day of redemption. The inheritance of children cannot and will not fail us. The Lord will surely deliver us from all evil, remove us entirely from this world, and preserve us unto His heavenly kingdom. With all the elect of God, with the entire congregation of the saints of God made perfect, we shall then behold the glory of God and praise Him forever and ever, because He has so gloriously carried out what He purposed to do in eternity.

When a Christian has finished reading the passage Eph. 1, 3—14, has pondered and taken to heart its comforting contents, and has appropriated them, he joins the apostle in giving thanks to God and the Father of Jesus Christ for all the temporal and eternal blessings of which he has been reminded in this passage, and he experiences no desire and inclination to make the mystery of eternity the subject of conjectures and speculations. Still, a question or two will arise which he cannot entirely push aside. When the eternal choice and election, which is particular in concept and essence, has been presented to him, he is apt to inquire, What is my fate? Do I belong to the elect? How can I know and be assured that I am elect? These are the inquiries of anxious souls who are concerned about their salvation, inquiries which flow from a sense of our need of salvation. We may expect *a priori* that Scripture, which teaches and offers us all that pertains to our salvation, will answer these questions. We find these questions actually answered in Eph. 1. The apostle in this passage speaks of the elect whom God has chosen, however, not merely in a general way, but he employs such terms as “we,” “us,” “you,” thus showing that he regards and designates the Christians as the elect. Hence, if a person can say, I am a Christian, he is to know and believe that he is elect. However, Paul in Eph. 1 explains at greater length wherein Christianity consists, and what we are and possess as Christians. These marks of Christianity, then, are also marks and tests of our election. The 11th Article of the Form of Concord in an extensive section treats the question how the individual Christian may know and be assured that he is one of the elect, and in this connection it refers to Eph. 1 as showing that God does not lead, and has not decreed to lead, His elect to salvation by any other way than the well-known universal way of salvation. To those whom God has elected in eternity He has the Word, the Gospel, proclaimed, proclaimed here in time; these He leads to faith, pardons and justifies them through faith; for just these people have been predestinated to the adoption of sons and to a holy and blameless conver-

sation in love. Accordingly, every Christian may and should draw this conclusion and say: I am, indeed, a poor sinner, deserving of no mercy, but I believe in Jesus Christ, who has redeemed me with His blood, and in whom I obtain grace and the forgiveness of sins. Through Christ I am a child of God, and though in much weakness, I now follow after holiness; I am walking so as to please God, my Heavenly Father, in every respect. Hence, I belong to the elect; for just these features are the marks of the elect. The entire present state of a Christian is a realization of God's eternal decree of election, a consequence and effect of election. This thought runs through the entire passage Eph. 1, 3—14. Thus I am justified in reasoning from the effect to the cause. The aforementioned manifestations of Christianity, repentance, faith, sanctification, are, indeed, of a subjective nature. In seasons of severe affliction the entire inward life of faith is shaken. And it is at such times that the inner marks of election become faint. Just that is the character of such spiritual trials as afflict seriously minded Christians, *viz.*, that they are on the point of questioning their own faith, that they begin to doubt whether their faith is of the genuine kind, that the consciousness of their child-state becomes dimmed, and that they are fearful lest their obedience and devotion are an utter sham and fraud. However, granted that the *notae internae electionis* are not always available, still the apostle in Eph. 1 points out also a *nota externa*, the Word of Truth, the Gospel of our salvation, which is exalted to the height of heaven above all vacillations and moods of the human heart, above all subjective occurrences and experiences, feelings and sensations, of a Christian. Accordingly, those whom God has chosen in eternity have the Gospel presented to them for that very reason. It is a special blessing of God which the apostle mentions in the words ἀκούσαντες τὸν λόγον, alongside of and prior to πιστεύσαντες; and this blessing flows from the eternal election of God. Hence, following the apostle's direction, I may and must draw this conclusion: Here is the Gospel of Christ with its precious promises, the universal promises of



grace, which are meant for every one that hears them, hence, for me also. And this Gospel is the Gospel of my salvation, which gives also to me the assurance that I shall be saved. What the Gospel promises is most certainly true. The Gospel is the Word of Truth. I hear the Gospel, the Word of Truth, with my ears. I hear, and I can read with mine own eyes, that God would have me to be saved. Consequently, it is beyond doubt that I, too, am elect.

A different kind of question which arises when men, also when Christians meditate the election of God, is this, What is the fate of the rest? We are not better than others; others are not worse than ourselves. Why did God elect us—me—rather than others? *Cur nos prae aliis?* This question does not arise from the desire to be saved, but from curiosity. It is a presumptuous question. And such presumptuous questions are not answered by Scripture, which reveals to us only what is useful for us to know, and what tends to our salvation. The information which the apostle offers in Eph. 1, 3—14 refers exclusively to Christians; it treats only of the elect and of the salvation of the elect, and does not say a word of the rest and of the fate of the rest. And in another place, Rom. 9—11, the apostle absolutely forbids Christians to try to discover the *discretio personarum*, and he counts the *causa discriminis* as one of the things which God has purposely concealed from us. Humble Christians promptly accept this direction, and suppress all presumptuous questions as soon as they arise in them. All manner of reflections and inferences are connected with the question: *Cur nos prae aliis?* Those who give the reins to their own thoughts at this point may reason thus: We are to be persuaded that it is a result and effect of the eternal election that we Christians believe the Gospel, that we have become the children of God by faith, and have been sealed with the Holy Spirit who keeps us from falling away. It follows, then, that, if others do not believe the Gospel, or fall away from faith, and are finally lost, the eternal background is lacking in their case; God, in electing, has passed them by. If God had elected them, they would

also believe and be saved. It is reason in its rude and carnal state which draws such conclusions, and with dirty hands manipulates and maltreats divine mysteries. Passages of Scripture, like Eph. 1, which treat of the election of grace, do not offer the slightest foothold for such reflections; they speak only of the election of grace, of the eternal divine decree which has for its objects the elect children of God, and they do not even remotely point to some decree of God, or to some omission on the part of God, which might be considered the *causa adaequata* of unbelief and of the damnation of many who are lost. And in other places Scripture teaches expressly that unbelief, defection, damnation have their cause in man himself, are incurred by man's own guilt, and that God has neglected or omitted no effort to save even those who will not be saved.

<sup>2)</sup> True, a discrepancy remains to our reasonable view of the matter between the statements of Scripture regarding the cause of salvation and the cause of damnation, inasmuch as Scripture ascribes the former to God alone, the latter to man alone. To our reasonable view a discrepancy remains between the particular election of grace and the universal gracious will of God; but this discrepancy is not *contradictio in adjecto*, since the election of grace and the gracious will of God are essentially different concepts. Our reason is ever inclined to draw this inference that those who are finally saved did not resist the Word and Spirit of God as determinedly as others, or that God did not will the salvation of those who are finally lost as earnestly as He willed the salvation of the elect. Every attempt to logically compose this difference leads either to Calvinism or synergism. As far as our salvation, and our need of salvation, is concerned, it is sufficient if we hold, without an attempt at curtailment, both sides of the truth, and leave it to God to conciliate this difference. True theology halts at the limits of the divine revelation.

Verily, a Christian who meditates on the grace of God, —

---

2) Footnote in the original.

also the eternal grace,—which has been bestowed on him, will not permit his look into the abyss of the divine mercy to become dimmed and obscured by useless questions and musings by which neither he nor others are profited. He will, rather, thank God for the salvation which has been brought to him, and he will leave God to do and deal with others as He sees fit.

There is, indeed, a pertinent question that may be raised as regards the salvation or damnation of men. There is a pertinent question that concerns the fate of our fellowmen. The question which is of primary importance, and most readily suggests itself, is concerning the salvation of our own soul, our standing with God, our relation to God, and God's relation to us. When facing God, we are not concerned about the rest and their relation to Him. But a person who is concerned about the salvation of his own soul seriously considers the salvation of his fellowmen after his own affairs with God have been adjusted. And when we have to do with men who do not know the way of peace, we do not speak to them of the election of grace and do not speculate about election or non-election. A missionary, every Christian, has a call to do mission work; he has something better to engage him than unprofitable questions on which he may speculate without ever solving them. We speak to the lost children whom we would like to save of Jesus Christ, the Savior of all men, also of the chiefest sinners. We assure them in the name of God that God would have all men to be saved and to come to the knowledge of the truth. God has no pleasure in the death of the wicked, but that the wicked turn from his evil way and live. Repent, therefore, and believe the Gospel! Moreover, we know that these words have the power to convert sinners and to soften hard hearts. And if a person absolutely will not hear us, we declare to him, It is your own fault, if you are lost; you do not deem yourself worthy of eternal life. This earnest warning and reproof may cause him to reflect and reconsider his attitude before it is too late. Those, now, who are struck and won over by such pleading, warning, and reproof we greet as brethren elect with us, and rejoice over

the increase which the household of God of which we are members has experienced through their return. Hence, the election of grace, and faith in our eternal election, do not hinder us in carrying out the duty which we owe to our neighbor, in executing our Christian calling on earth. The comfort derived from the election of grace, our assurance of salvation, is no reason why we should be inactive and resign ourselves to idle security. On the contrary, any person who for his part is certain of salvation, who believes with his whole heart that God has elected him unto salvation before the foundation of the world, will employ every day of his life, and all his strength, in aiding others to obtain salvation. The election of grace enables us to rightly understand what the grace of God is; and the more firmly we become grounded in the grace of God and in our knowledge of divine grace, the more able, proficient, and willing we become to praise and commend the grace of God to others and to proclaim to our fellowmen the universal gracious will of God.

---

## THE PROOF TEXTS OF THE CATECHISM WITH A PRACTICAL COMMENTARY.

---

### THE SECOND ARTICLE.

(Continued.)

#### THE STATE OF HUMILIATION.

Phil. 2, 5—8: *Let this mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus, who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God, but made Himself of no reputation, and took upon Him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men: and being found in fashion as a man, He humbled Himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross.*

*“Let this mind be in you which was also in Christ Jesus.”* Christ is set forth as a pattern from which Christians should copy. What mind was in Christ? *“He humbled Himself.”*



So Christ is a pattern of humility for the Christians. This is the scope of the present passage, and must not be overlooked in its interpretation. *Baldwin*: "Hoc observetur tantum scopus apostoli nostri, cui propositum non est, docere, quomodo Filius Dei carnem assumerit, sed quomodo Jesus Christus in sua humanitate formam servi assumerit *et hoc ipso exemplum humilitatis suis reliquerit.*" At the same time we have in this text the *sedes doctrinae* for the state of humiliation.

1. *Who humbled Himself?* "He," "Christ Jesus." Let us mark this well! Christ Jesus humbled Himself, the God-man, this Person who possesses a divine and a human nature, this theanthropic person. So who is humiliated and afterwards exalted? The *person* of Christ Jesus. *Quenstedt*: "Subiectum quod est persona τοῦ λόγου, non qua ἄσαρκος et incarnanda, sed qua ἑνσαρκος et incarnata." The entire context bears out this statement. Of the *Χριστὸς ἑνσαρκος* only the apostle can say that He "made Himself of no reputation," "He humbled Himself," and, later, that He "was exalted."

2. *According to which nature did Christ humble Himself?* According to His *human* nature. For *a priori*: the *divine* nature cannot be abased and cannot be exalted; it is immutable. *In Deum non cadit mutatio.* Again: The apostle says: "Let this mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus,"—be humble! According to His *divine* nature Christ would not be presented to us as an example whom we were to follow. And again: The text says: He took upon Himself the form of a servant; He was made in the likeness of men; found in fashion as a man; He died—all of which can be said of the *human* nature only.

3. *Wherein does the humiliation not consist?* Not in the assumption of the human nature. One may call that a condescension, but not humiliation in the Biblical sense of the term. If His humiliation had consisted in His assumption of the human nature, His exaltation would consist in the laying aside of His human nature, and Christ would no longer be the God-man! The text does not say: "He was made *man*," but: "He was made *in the likeness* of men." Furthermore, as we have

seen, the subject of the whole discourse is Christ Jesus, the God-man. This theanthropic person, possessing a divine and a human nature, "*was made in the likeness of men,*" "*took upon Himself the form of a servant.*" So "the form of a servant" is not equivalent to His human nature, because that He already had and hence could not "take upon Himself."

4. *What, then, is the state of humiliation?* St. Paul says: "*Christ Jesus, being*" — existing — "*in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God, but made Himself of no reputation,*" etc. What is the form of God? Clearly not the divine nature, otherwise the form of a servant were His human nature; of this form of a servant, however, Christ divested Himself, consequently that would be asserting that Christ is no longer true man. *Form*, μορφή, *Gestalt*, is the external manifestation, it is that whereby one is known, is seen; *form of God* is the external manifestation of God, that whereby God is known, is seen. The *essence* of God is presupposed; only He who possesses the *essence* of God can exist in the *form* of God. The *form* is the manifestation of the *essence*. God only can appear in the form of God. Since Christ is in the *form of God*, He is true God. God is invisible; still a *form*, *Gestalt*, is predicated of Him. The *form* of God is that whereby this invisible God manifests Himself as God. The μορφή θεοῦ is equivalent to the δόξα θεοῦ, the glory of God, John 1, 14, i. e., the aggregate of all divine attributes, especially His omnipotence, His omniscience, and His omnipresence. "The Word was made flesh," says St. John, "and dwelt among us, and we beheld His glory, the glory as of the Only-Begotten of the Father." By the manifestation of His divine attributes, of His divine majesty, they saw this *man* Christ is almighty, this *man* is God.

"Being in the form of God," Christ was "equal with God." Ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ ἐπαρχων = "in the form of God existing;" ἐπαρχων = existing — is a very emphatic participle. It shows: 1. that Christ *did not take upon Himself* the form of God, as it is said that He "took upon Himself the form of a servant," but that *He existed in it*; 2. that with the form of God Christ

is said to have possessed, at the same time, a divine essence and nature; that Christ Jesus, when He had taken upon Himself *the form of a servant*, neither laid aside the divine nature itself, nor in any way resigned the form of God. (Quenstedt.) — Christ existed in the form of God, and hence could have exercised it to its fullest extent, could have always made use of His divine majesty imparted to Him according to His human nature; He could at all times have acted as God, so that all might have seen this *μορφῇ θεοῦ* at all times. But this He did not do. For the text reads: “*He thought it not robbery to be equal with God,*” i. e., He possessed the equality with God, but did not think this a thing of booty that should be used as a means of self-glorification. And that He did not look upon this being equal with God as robbery, as booty, may be seen from the fact that he manifested this form of God, His divine majesty, only now and then in the service of the brethren, but not for His own honor and glory. —

So Christ might at all times have made use of this *form of God*. He did not—for a purpose: He wanted to become our Substitute and Savior, and so He “*made Himself of no reputation,*” etc. That is to say, as a rule, He laid aside the use of His divine majesty communicated to His human nature. He became a man like unto ourselves; He became a servant instead of a master; He humbled Himself so deeply as to die the death of a vile criminal on the cross; and all this He did for our sakes.

5. *Rays of glory.* The passages cited in the Catechism prove conclusively that Christ possessed “the form of God,” divine majesty, in the state of humiliation. John 2, 11 says that by the miracle of His turning water into wine Christ “manifested forth His glory.” John 11, 40 ff. speaks of the climax of Christ’s miracles, the raising of Lazarus. John 18, 6 tells us that with the words, “I am He,” Christ felled His captors to the ground. Aye, indeed, this man Jesus is almighty. Instances might be multiplied. Read Matt. 8, 23—27, which relates His stilling the tempest. In v. 24 we read: “He was

asleep." Here we see the form of the servant: He slept. "He was made in the likeness of men;" like other men He was in need of sleep; "He was found in fashion like a man." Reading v. 26, we behold "the form of God." The danger to that frail craft was exceedingly great, but the angry waves were obedient to His will. "He rebuked the winds and the sea; and there was a great calm." Whenever it pleased Him, He could make use of His divine majesty, as here. In v. 27 the men marveling say: "What manner of man is this, that even the winds and the sea obey Him?" He is "in the likeness of men," just like other men; yet He must be something greater. He cannot be from the earth, He must be from heaven! They saw the form of God, the majesty of God. They saw He was "equal with God." And it was not robbery on the part of Christ to act as He did act, for He was God even in the state of humiliation. — Or take Mark 5, 41 ff. The daughter of Jairus was dead. Christ had said, "The damsel is not dead." "They laughed Him to scorn." He was in fashion as a man; this they saw. The girl was dead; this they knew. Christ brought her to life: "Talitha, cumi!" The sneers were turned into astonishment; they saw the form of God.

---

We append a running commentary. "*Let this mind be in you which was also in Christ Jesus,*" be humble, "*who, being*" — existing — "*in the form of God,*" having in or about Him that whereby God is known, seen, or manifested as God, "*thought it not robbery to be equal with God,*" counted not the being on an equality with God a thing to be grasped, esteemed it not rapine to be equal with God. In ancient times the victors looked upon their booty as upon a means of self-glorification and so used it. Thus Christ did not look upon His being equal with God; He did not make a boast, a display, of it; He did not use it constantly and fully, "*but,*" though He could have done so, "*He made Himself of no reputation,*" He emptied Himself. What this means the preceding context reveals negatively: He did not make a boast of His equality with



God. The succeeding context states the thought positively: He emptied Himself, "*taking the form of a servant.*" Christ, the God-man, who also according to His human nature possessed all power in heaven and on earth; who, also according to His human nature in the state of humiliation was the Lord of lords, He, whom the heavenly hosts would gladly have served at all times, came to serve others, to serve, to redeem us. The concept *form of a servant* is developed in the next phrases: "*being made in the likeness of men, and being found in fashion as a man.*" He was a man like other men, yet without sin. This "likeness" was manifested: He ate, He drank, He wept, He slept; thus He was "found in fashion as a man;" thus "*He humbled Himself.*" He did it; it was an act of His; willingly He humbled Himself. Willingly, for our sakes, He forewent high stations, honors, prerogatives, which He might rightfully claim and enjoy. And when the apostle says: "*and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross,*" he indicates the last stage of humiliation, the climax of self-humiliation. So deeply Christ humbled Himself that He died the death of a vile criminal—for us! On the cross He cried out, "It"—the work of redemption—"is finished!" That was the purpose of His humiliation—our salvation! That was the reason why He did not employ His divine majesty constantly which He at all times possessed. The purpose of His humiliation was to swallow death up into victory, that we might bless God, saying: "Thanks be to God which giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ!"

### *The Conception of Christ.*

Luke 1, 35: *The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee: therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God.*

The angel Gabriel was sent to Mary, a descendant of David. His sudden appearance and unusual greeting amaze Mary. The angel tells her, she, the virgin, is to become the

mother of a son whom God will have named Jesus, Savior. This her son is at the same time to be the Son of God, and is to fulfill the prophecies concerning the son of David, the eternal King of Israel. Mary asks wonderingly, "How shall this be, seeing I know not a man?" Gabriel explains matters, saying, "*The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee,*" and thus "*the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee,*" and in the power of God, the Holy Ghost, Mary shall conceive. Here, then, we have a proof passage for the words of the Creed: "Conceived by the Holy Ghost." What we are here told is wonderfully corroborated by the account of Christ's conception, Matt. 1, 18: "She (Mary) was found with child of (ἐκ) *the Holy Ghost,*" and by the divine message of the angel to Joseph: "Fear not to take unto thee Mary, thy wife; for that which is *conceived in her is of the Holy Ghost,*" v. 20.

Her son, so Mary is told, will not owe his existence as man to a human father, but to the miraculous operation of the Holy Ghost, and hence "*also that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God.*" Here Christ's humanity and divinity are asserted. Mary's son is the Son of God. "*That holy thing which shall be born of thee*": thus the child of the Virgin Mary is distinguished from all other children of men. Man, born according to the common course of nature, is sinful. What is born of the flesh is flesh. Mary's son, however, is "holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners," Hebr. 7, 26; "in Him is no sin," 1 John 3, 5; He knows of no sin, 2 Cor. 5, 21. Mary's son is the Son of God. A miraculous conception, a wonderful birth! If asked how it came to pass, we answer with the theologians of old:

Quid sit nasci, quid processus,  
Me nescire sum professus.

### *The Birth of Christ.*

Is. 9, 6: *Unto us a Child is born, unto us a Son is given.*

Seven centuries before the Christian era Isaiah prophesied of Christ's conception and birth, saying: "Behold, a virgin shall conceive and bear a son, and shall call His name Im-

manuel," Is. 7, 14; and again: "Unto us a Child is born, unto us a Son is given." Noting the context of the latter passage, we observe the prophet speaking of a great light shining to a people walking in darkness. The result of the illumination shed by that light is joy, great joy. Who is this great light? Immanuel. He is the cause of all this gladness. As to the structure of this passage, we notice that the prophet has employed the *parallelismus membrorum*, which abounds in Hebrew poetry. The two members virtually express the same thought, the latter enforcing the former, thus throwing more light upon it. "*A Child is born,*" a child of human flesh and blood. This Child is a *son*. Immanuel, Christ, is true man. This Child is *given*. Christ here appears as a gift, a gracious gift of God. God's grace impelled Him to bestow this gift upon us. It is a wonderful Child indeed. Commonly speaking, a child is born unto his parents, but this Child is born *unto us*, is given *unto us*, unto all people. And man, walking in darkness, all his thoughts, words, and deeds being enmity against God, had and has need of this *Child*, this *Son*. Man, without Him, must be damned everlastingly. Only the true believers, however, who know what a precious gift He is, can exult with the prophet: "Unto *us* a Child is born, unto *us* a Son is given!" — And as to the fulfillment of the prophecy see Matt. 1, 21 ff.: "And she" (the Virgin Mary) "shall bring forth a *son*, and thou shalt call His name *Jesus*, for He shall save His people from their sins. Now all this was done that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet, saying: Behold, a *virgin* shall be with *child*, and shall bring forth a *son*, and they shall call His name *Immanuel*, which, being interpreted, is, God with us." Cf. Luke 2, 41; John 1, 14; Gal. 4, 4.

#### *The Burial of Christ.*

Ps. 16, 10: *Thou wilt not suffer Thine Holy One to see corruption.*

This passage is quoted by Peter in his great discourse on the day of Pentecost, Acts 2, 27. This proves beyond doubt



that Christ is God's *Holy One*. When the psalmist says of the *Holy One*, the God-man, that He is not "*to see corruption*," he speaks of Him according to that nature according to which He had flesh and blood, and according to which He might have seen corruption had He not been the *Holy One*. This truth, so plainly stated in the Old Testament, finds its corroboration in the New. Christ's sacred body was laid in the sepulcher and remained there to the third day without seeing corruption.

### *The Purpose of Christ's Humiliation.*

Christ was not compelled to undergo this humiliation, but He did it willingly, out of love to us. In this state He carried out the work of redemption. Hence, in answer to the question, "For what purpose did Christ thus humiliate Himself?" our Catechism says: "To redeem me, a lost and condemned sinner."—This topic, having frequently been dwelt upon in the explanation of preceding passages, needs but brief mention here.

Rom. 3, 23: "For all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God." Since all have sinned, all men by nature are lost and condemned creatures. But "the Son of Man is come to save that which was lost," Matt. 18, 11. Since all men by nature are lost, Christ has saved all without exception. This truth Scripture reiterates again and again. "Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world," John 1, 29. He taketh away the sin of the world, *i. e.*, of all men. "He is the propitiation for our sins, and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world," 1 John 2, 2. Christ has even bought them that deny Him, 2 Pet. 2, 1. So whosoever is now lost is lost of his own fault. In answer to the question, "Whom has Christ redeemed?" we confess: "Me, and all lost and damned sinners." (Cf. Mezger, *Entwuerfe*, p. 136.)

Springfield, Ill.

L. WESSEL.